Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

(1)

No. 971684

APR 14 1998

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Petitioner,

—v.—

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

GLORIA C. PHARES
JEFFREY H. BLUM
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB & TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 336-2000

R. BRUCE RICH
BERNADETTE M. MCCANN EZRING
JONATHAN BLOOM
MARC BROTMAN
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153
(212) 310-8000

DAVID D. COLE
Counsel of Record
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 662-9078

Attorneys for Petitioner

88 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Petitioner contracted with Amtrak to display an advertisement urging people not to buy Coors beer for political reasons. When Amtrak saw the advertisement, it refused to display it, based on an asserted policy—unwritten and previously unenforced—against "political advertising." The questions presented are:

I. Whether, in its public forum analysis, the court of appeals erred by accepting Amtrak's *post hoc* assertions about the forum and ignoring objective evidence concerning Amtrak's prior practice and experience in implementing its stationwide advertising policy.

II. Whether Amtrak discriminated on the basis of viewpoint where (a) it previously had permitted the display of conservative political advertising; and (b) it would have permitted petitioner's ad had he addressed the same subject matter from a commercial rather than a political viewpoint.

III. Whether Amtrak's unwritten and undefined policy against "political" advertising was unconstitutionally vague under this Court's decision in *Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell*, 425 U.S. 610 (1976), which held impermissibly vague the term "political . . . cause."

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

Petitioner Michael A. Lebron was plaintiff-counter-defendant-appellee below. Respondent the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) was defendant-appellant below. Transportation Displays, Incorporated, a defendant in the proceedings before the district court, appears on the caption of the proceedings below as defendant-counter-claimant but did not participate in the proceedings before the court of appeals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED	2
STATEMENT	2
1. Introduction	2
2. Statement of Facts	4
Penn Station and the Spectacular	4
Lebron-Amtrak Contract	5
Amtrak's Advertising Policy	6
Amtrak's Advertising Practices at Penn Station	7
Amtrak's Related Free Speech Activities	8
3. Prior Proceedings	8
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	11

PAGE

I. The Court of Appeals' Refusal to Consider Objective Evidence of Amtrak's Past Display of Political Advertising in Penn Station to Assess the Nature of the Forum Conflicts With Decisions of this Court and Several Circuits 13

II. The Panel's Decision that Amtrak's Policy Is Viewpoint-Neutral Conflicts with Decisions of This Court and Other Circuits . 18

III. The Panel's Decision that Amtrak's Policy is Not Unconstitutionally Vague Conflicts with This Court's Decision in *Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell* 21

CONCLUSION 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

AIDS Action Comm. v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth., 42 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 1994) 13, 18, 19

Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Department of Aviation, 45 F.3d 1144 (7th Cir. 1995) 13-15, 19, 22, 23

Church on the Rock v. City of Albuquerque, 84 F.3d 1273 (10th Cir. 1996) 13, 19

City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co., 486 U.S. 750 (1988) 22, 23

Concerned Women for America, Inc. v. Lafayette Cty., 883 F.2d 32 (5th Cir. 1989) 15

PAGE

Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Educ. Fund, Inc., 473 U.S. 788 (1985) 15

Erznoznik v. City of Jacksonville, 422 U.S. 205 (1975) 23

Gay Lesbian Bisexual Alliance v. Pryor, 110 F.3d 1543 (11th Cir. 1997) 13, 20

Grace Bible Fellowship, Inc. v. Maine Sch. Admin. Dist. #5, 941 F.2d 45 (1st Cir. 1991) 15

Hevesi v. Metropolitan Transp. Auth., 827 F. Supp. 1069 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) 23

Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell, 425 U.S. 610 (1976) 13, 21-23

International Soc'y for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee, 505 U.S. 672 (1992) 12, 16, 18

Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist., 508 U.S. 384 (1993) 12, 18, 20, 21

Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 116 S. Ct. 1675 (1996) 4

Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 513 U.S. 374 (1995) 3

Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 69 F.3d 650 (2d Cir. 1995) 1

Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 12 F.3d 388 (2d Cir. 1993) 1

Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 981 F. Supp. 279 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) 4

PAGE

Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), 881 F. Supp. 993 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) 1

Lebron v. Washington Metropolitan Transit Auth., 749 F.2d 893 (D.C. Cir. 1984) 23

Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, 418 U.S. 298 (1974) 20-23

Paulsen v. County of Nassau, 925 F.2d 65 (2d Cir. 1991) 15

Penthouse Int'l, Ltd. v. Koch, 599 F. Supp. 1338 (S.D.N.Y. 1984) 23

Perry Educ. Ass'n v. Perry Local Educ. Ass'n, 460 U.S. 37 (1983) 15

Planned Parenthood Ass'n v. Chicago Transit Auth., 767 F.2d 1225 (7th Cir. 1985) 23

Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Virginia, 515 U.S. 819 (1995) 12, 20, 21

Stewart v. District of Columbia Armory Bd., 863 F.2d 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1988) 15

Streetwatch v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 875 F. Supp. 1055 (S.D.N.Y. 1995) 4

U.S. Southwest Africa/Namibia Trade & Cultural Council v. United States, 708 F.2d 760 (D.C. Cir. 1983) 23

United States v. Kokinda, 497 U.S. 720 (1990) 12, 16

Constitution, Statutes:

U.S. Const., amend. I ..... *passim*

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) 2

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

No. _____

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Petitioner,

—v.—

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Michael A. Lebron respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the court of appeals on which this petition is based (App., *infra*, 1a-24a) is reported at 69 F.3d 650; its revised opinion on re-hearing (*id.* at 1b-6b) is reported at 89 F.3d 39.[1] The opinion of the district court (*id.* at 1c-22c) is reported at 811 F. Supp. 993.

[1] "App." refers to the appendix to this petition. "A," "E," and "SE" refer respectively to the following documents in the court of appeals: the appendix, the exhibit volumes, and the supplemental exhibit volume.

JURISDICTION

The final order of the court of appeals was entered on January 14, 1998 (App., *infra*, 1d-4d). The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

The First Amendment states in pertinent part that:

> Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech. . . .

STATEMENT

1. Introduction

This case arises out of a decision by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("Amtrak") not to display petitioner Michael A. Lebron's advertisement on a billboard in New York's Pennsylvania Station ("Penn Station"). Lebron's advertisement urges viewers not to buy Coors beer because the Coors Brewing Company supports various conservative causes. In rejecting the ad, Amtrak invoked an unwritten and undisseminated stationwide policy against "political" advertising. Amtrak had never before rejected an ad for display anywhere in Penn Station on the ground that it was political, and had permitted the display of political ads for years.

The district court, per then-District Judge Pierre N. Leval, found that: (1) Amtrak had in fact displayed numerous political ads in Penn Station in the past; (2) Amtrak's written standards permitted noncommercial public service advertising; (3) many of the people responsible for Amtrak advertising had never even heard of the asserted unwritten policy; and (4) those who had heard of the policy could not coherently define it. The court therefore held that Amtrak's policy against political advertising violated the Constitution because

it was unwritten, vague, inconsistently applied, and potentially viewpoint-based (depending on which of the many different definitions of the policy applied).

The court of appeals reversed, with then-Chief Judge Jon O. Newman dissenting.[2] App., *infra*, 1a, 18a. The court rested its decision on what it characterized as its "finding" that Amtrak had two policies—one limited to the Spectacular, the particular billboard to which Lebron sought access, and another governing advertising in the rest of Penn Station. *Id.* at 15a, 16a. As a result, the panel deemed irrelevant Amtrak's past advertising practices on other billboards in Penn Station, and held that Lebron lacked standing to challenge Amtrak's general Penn Station advertising policy because it had not been applied to him. *Id.* at 16a-18a.

Lebron sought rehearing on the ground that the linchpin of the panel's decision—its "finding" that there was a unique policy applying only to the Spectacular—was contrary to both the district court's finding *and* Amtrak's admission that one set of advertising standards governed all of Penn Station. The panel then issued an amended opinion, deleting its erroneous "finding," but failing to change its legal analysis in any respect. App., *infra*, 1b-4b. Judge Newman dissented again, maintaining that once the panel acknowledged that there was only one policy, its legal analysis had no foundation. *Id.* at 4b-6b. In its amended opinion, the panel also *sua sponte* reinstated to the district court the state contract claims it had dismissed in 1993, despite the fact that Lebron had not asked that these claims be reinstated.

---

[2] By the same divided vote, the panel initially reversed on state action grounds, holding that Amtrak was a private entity not subject to constitutional constraints. 12 F.3d 388 (2d Cir. 1993). This Court reversed, holding that Amtrak is a governmental actor for constitutional purposes, and remanded to the court of appeals to permit it to address Lebron's First Amendment claims. *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak)*, 513 U.S. 374 (1995).

When Lebron petitioned for certiorari from this decision, Amtrak's first ground for opposing certiorari was that "the case is not ripe for review, because petitioner's contract claim remains to be decided by the courts below." Amtrak's Brief in Opposition at 2. This Court denied certiorari. 116 S. Ct. 1675 (1996).

The case was remanded to the district court to resolve petitioner's contract claims, and on October 23, 1997, the district court dismissed the remaining contract claims. *Lebron v. National Railroad Passenger Corp. (Amtrak)*, 981 F. Supp. 279 (S.D.N.Y. 1997). Petitioner appealed only from Claims 1, 2, and 3 of the Complaint relating to his constitutional claims. Because the court of appeals' 1995 decision (App. 1a-24a, 1b-6b) on those issues was the law of the case, the parties jointly moved for summary affirmance, which the court of appeals granted (App., *infra*, 1d-4d).

2. Statement of Facts

The facts, as found by the district court and stipulated by Amtrak (SE2365-68, SE2381-84), are as follows:

Penn Station and the Spectacular. Penn Station, owned by Amtrak, is one of the busiest public crossroads of pedestrian traffic in New York City. Approximately 200,000 people pass through the station every day going to and from the Amtrak, New Jersey Transit, and Long Island Railroad trains that use the station, and the New York subway that abuts it. SE2365; A338-39, A341; *Streetwatch v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 875 F. Supp. 1055, 1057 (S.D.N.Y. 1995).

Penn Station is a large, multi-purpose facility. Its upper level, where the Spectacular billboard at issue here is located, combines the railroad station with numerous restaurants and shops, providing an underground "Main Street" for the traveling public. The station includes a bookstore, several newsstands, a jewelry store, bakeries, novelty and souvenir shops, drugstores, several restaurants and fast food shops, a bank,

clothing stores, a cutlery shop, bars, flower stalls, and an electronics store. A517; E1297-1303.

Amtrak leases space to advertisers throughout Penn Station, on numerous billboards, dioramas, and kiosks. The Spectacular billboard is a large, curved, back-lit display space approximately 103 feet long by 10 feet high, located on the east-facing wall of the station's rotunda. App., *infra*, 2c. Immediately in front of the Spectacular in the rotunda is a four-sided advertising kiosk.

Lebron-Amtrak Contract. Lebron first contacted Transportation Displays Incorporated ("TDI"), Amtrak's advertising agent, about leasing billboard space in Penn Station in August 1991. App., *infra*, 2c. Lebron told TDI that his work was "political," and showed TDI's representative examples of his prior political work.[3] TDI never suggested that the political nature of the work would be a problem, and assured Lebron that while obscene or violent displays would not be accepted, there were no other policy restrictions on advertising. *Id.* at 3c.

Lebron and TDI signed a contract on November 30, 1992, leasing the Spectacular to Lebron for January and February 1993. App., *infra*, 3c. On December 2, 1992, Lebron provided TDI with a copy of his work pursuant to the contract provision that "[a]ll advertising copy is subject to approval of TDI and the Transportation Facility concerned as to character, text, illustration, design and operation." *Id.*

The work is a photomontage with text, in the style of a beer advertisement, which urges would-be purchasers not to buy Coors beer because the owners of the Coors Brewing Company support various conservative causes. *See* E2211. It states clearly that Lebron paid for the work, and explicitly disclaims any association with the work by "TDI, Amtrak, or The Port

---

[3] SE2375-76; A160-65, A167-68, A170-71, A174-75, A212-13; A586- 88; E2137-41.

Authority of New York & New Jersey." SE2370; A230, A252; E2213.

TDI sent Lebron's work to Amtrak. App., *infra*, 4c. Anthony DeAngelo, the Amtrak Vice President for Real Estate and Operations Development responsible for advertising on Amtrak property, rejected Lebron's work, claiming that Amtrak had a "policy" against "political" advertisements. *Id.*[4]

Amtrak's Advertising Policy. The policy that Amtrak asserted, *ex post*, to reject Lebron's ad was unwritten, undisseminated, and undefined.[5] Amtrak's executives "were themselves at odds over the meaning of Amtrak's policy." App., *infra*, 17c.

DeAngelo testified that Amtrak's "policy" prohibits advertisements that are "objectionable to our riding public and others associated with us including political and other types of potentially controversial matters." A349. He defined "objectionable to the riding public" as:

> Issues that would cause our passengers to be concerned and upset to write letters to us, to talk about it amongst themselves and things which they would find inappropriate for Amtrak to be a part of.

A378. DeAngelo initially defined "political" as "mostly noncommercial," A352, but stated that advertisements that do not sell products are only "potentially" political. A354.

---

[4] When Amtrak rejected Lebron's ad, TDI offered to rent Lebron space on other billboards in New York, but did not offer any billboard space in Penn Station, in light of Amtrak's asserted policy.

[5] Several expired and superseded contracts governing Penn Station advertising included references to a policy against political advertising, App., *infra*, 15c, but, as the district court noted, the contracts in force when this dispute arose contained no such language. *Id.* at 16c. In fact, the TDI-Amtrak contract in force when this dispute arose expressly *permitted* the display of public service and nonprofit advertising in Penn Station. *Id.* at 19c.

Others had different understandings. Bruce Bourque, who conducts the initial reviews of advertising for the Spectacular (and also reviewed Lebron's work), admitted that he "could not really say what [a policy barring 'political' advertising] meant." App., *infra*, 17c. Bourque identified many commercial advertisements as "political." A835-36, A843; E306. William Delaney, who also reviews advertising content for Amtrak, had never even *heard* of a policy against political or any other advertising (other than a prohibition on competitive advertising). App., *infra*, 16c. No one at TDI, Amtrak's agent for all Penn Station advertising, was aware that Amtrak had a policy against political advertising.[6] *Id.*

DeAngelo has never informed members of his staff responsible for inspecting advertising in Amtrak stations of any policy against political advertising. The staff is simply expected to use its "common sense" in evaluating whether advertisements are "contributing to the overall effectiveness" of the station. A359-60, A362-65, A386-88.

Amtrak's Advertising Practices at Penn Station. Amtrak maintained both in the district court and on appeal that its policy against political advertising applied to all advertising in Penn Station. SE2384; Resp. CA Br. at 7. Yet until this case, Amtrak had never disapproved a single ad as "political" or "objectionable." A371-72, A384-85, A755-57, A770-71; A823. In fact, Amtrak consistently had displayed political advertising at Penn Station, without a single objection from the riding public. A392-93, A617. For example, since at least 1988, The Worldwide Church of God had leased a four-sided, seven-foot high kiosk immediately in front of the Spectacu-

---

[6] TDI's own advertising guidelines, upon which its agents rely, expressly permit political and other ideological advertising. A628; E176. They also permit public service advertising, defined as "non-commercial, non-partisan" advertisements not designed to influence elections or legislation. E178. TDI's public service advertising has included subjects such as homelessness, the environment, drunk driving, AIDS awareness, health issues, and race relations. A622, A626.

lar to advertise and distribute *The Plain Truth*, a free noncommercial magazine addressing social and political issues such as homosexuality, gambling, and the Arab-Israeli conflict. App., *infra*, 7a, 20c. *The Plain Truth* ad displayed when this suit commenced featured a magazine cover urging readers to "Say No To Adultery." A256-57; E202-03.[7] Amtrak has also leased space in Penn Station to other noncommercial and/or political advertisers, including the New York Department of the Environment, the New York Department of Commerce, and a muscular dystrophy foundation. *Id.*

Amtrak's Related Free Speech Activities. Amtrak's "Regulations For Exercise Of Certain Free Speech Rights In Pennsylvania Station, NYC," permit distribution of literature, display of placards and engagement of passersby in conversation about "religious, political or other views to the extent protected by the First Amendment . . . of the Constitution." SE2396; E114-120. Pursuant to these guidelines, Amtrak has permitted a variety of individuals and organizations to distribute political literature, engage in political discussions, and solicit funds for political causes within Penn Station, all without any adverse consequences to the "riding public." SE2396-97; E117, E287-88, E290, E292-93.[8]

3. Prior Proceedings

A. The district court concluded that Amtrak's policy was unconstitutional because it was unwritten, vague, had been applied in a discriminatory fashion, and might constitute viewpoint discrimination, depending on which of the many

---

[7] The kiosk had bins attached to it containing copies of the magazine for free distribution to the public. E202-03.

[8] Amtrak also leases space to numerous book stores and news stands in Penn Station, which sell books and magazines on political issues. E1297-1303. Amtrak does not prevent these proprietors from selling or advertising literature with political messages. A518. And no one has ever complained about the political content of books or magazines sold by Penn Station retailers. A519.

definitions Amtrak had offered was in fact applicable. App., *infra*, 15c-22c. In reaching this result, the court found (and Amtrak stipulated) that the policy invoked against Lebron was not specific to the Spectacular, but applied throughout Penn Station. *Id.* at 20c n.12; SE2384.[9] Because one policy governed all of Amtrak's Penn Station advertising, the district court examined how the policy had been implemented throughout the station to determine its scope and application. App., *infra*, 19c-20c.

B. The court of appeals reversed in a divided opinion. As noted above, the panel majority based its reversal on a "finding" that there were two separate policies, one limited to the Spectacular, and another for the rest of Penn Station advertising. App., *infra*, 15a, 16a. In light of this finding, it deemed irrelevant evidence of political advertising in the rest of Penn Station, and it concluded that Amtrak's Spectacular policy had been consistently applied because no political ads had been displayed on the Spectacular itself.[10] *Id.* at 15a, 16a.

The panel's presumption that the policy at issue was limited to the Spectacular was central to each of its legal conclusions. First, the Court concluded that the Spectacular is "a nonpublic forum, or perhaps . . . a limited public forum opened for purely commercial speech," only by ignoring the fact that Amtrak had displayed numerous political and non-commercial ads under the same policy that governed the Spectacular. App., *infra*, 11a. Second, the panel found the

---

[9] According to Amtrak, the *only* difference between its treatment of the Spectacular and other advertising space in Penn Station is procedural: with other advertising spaces, Amtrak applies its policy against "political" advertising after advertisements are displayed, whereas with the Spectacular, it applies that policy before the advertisement is displayed. The substantive content of the policy, however, is the same. SE2390; A359-60; A374-75, A383-84; A607-08.

[10] There had been only six previous advertisers on the Spectacular, which tended to be leased out for long-term contacts. None of these prior advertisers had sought to display a political ad. Resp. CA Br. at 7 n.5.

policy "reasonable . . . to avoid the criticism and the embarrassments of allowing any display seeming to favor any political view," *id.* at 13a, 14a, again only by disregarding the fact that Amtrak had accepted other political messages in Penn Station without triggering any criticism or embarrassment. And third, the panel's conclusion that Amtrak's policy was neither viewpoint-based nor vague depended on its finding that Amtrak had not permitted political advertising previously on the Spectacular. App., *infra*, 14a-15a, 15a-16a.

Then-Chief Judge Newman dissented. App., *infra*, 18a. He criticized the panel's failure to consider Amtrak's treatment of advertising throughout Penn Station. Under the panel's view, he reasoned, Amtrak could deny use of the Spectacular for Republican Party advertising even if it had permitted the Democratic Party to advertise on one of the dioramas flanking the Spectacular. *Id.* at 20a-21a. In Judge Newman's view, "Amtrak's violation of the First Amendment is evident, because it has leased advertising space on a kiosk in the rotunda for *The Plain Truth*, a magazine the Court acknowledges is devoted to 'political and social issues.' " *Id.* at 21a.

Judge Newman also criticized the majority's conclusion that Amtrak's policy was not vague simply because it had not previously permitted political ads on the Spectacular. "[W]here a policy is unwritten, unclear, and undisseminated, the fact that it has not yet been used discriminatorily does not save it from invalidation." App., *infra*, 21a. "The vice of conferring discretion on government officials to determine which messages may be conveyed is not avoided by their past pattern of not making a discriminatory decision. The vice inheres in the opportunity for discrimination . . . ." *Id.* at 22a-23a.[11]

---

[11] While he found it unnecessary to reach the question given the policy's other constitutional infirmities, Judge Newman also observed that Amtrak's policy may constitute viewpoint discrimination, because it allows ads promoting the sale of beer for commercial reasons, but bars an ad opposing the purchase of the same product for political reasons. App., *infra*, 23a-24a.

C. Petitioner sought rehearing, pointing out that the so-called "finding" on which every one of the panel's legal conclusions was grounded conflicted with the district court's finding (and Amtrak's stipulation) that Amtrak's advertising policy applied to all advertising in Penn Station and not just to the Spectacular. In response, the panel majority denied rehearing and issued an amended opinion in which it simply deleted the sentences that had expressly referred to its "finding" of a Spectacular-specific policy. App., *infra*, 3b. It made no substantive change in its legal analysis or conclusion.

Dissenting from the denial of rehearing, Judge Newman noted that the deletions from the court of appeals' decision "leave the Court's legal analysis . . . even more vulnerable than I thought it was in my original opinion." App., *infra*, 5b. Judge Newman observed that none of the legal conclusions in the court's revised opinion had a factual foundation. *Id.* at 5b-6b. Moreover, he maintained, "no matter what the scope of the forum, a governmental entity violates the First Amendment when it bars display of political messages pursuant to a 'policy' that has been found by a fact-finder, with abundant evidentiary support, to be vague, unwritten, undisseminated, unclear to those who administer it, and inconsistently applied." *Id.* at 6b.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Before Michael Lebron came along, Amtrak had regularly permitted the display of political advertising in Penn Station, and had never rejected any ad for its political content. Yet the panel majority held that Amtrak could refuse to display Lebron's advertisement by asserting a policy against "political" advertising that was unwritten, undisseminated, undefined, and never before invoked. There are three reasons to grant a writ of certiorari.

First, the panel's conception and application of the public forum doctrine conflicts with decisions of this Court and several federal courts of appeal. The panel concluded that the Spectacular was a nonpublic forum by accepting Amtrak's *post hoc* assertions regarding its policy and ignoring Amtrak's actual practice in implementing that policy throughout Penn Station. Several members of this Court have stressed the dangerous circularity of predicating public forum analysis on governmental assertions that a forum is closed to a particular type of speech without carefully examining the property's past uses and physical characteristics.[12] When one looks at Amtrak's practice rather than its words, it is clear that Amtrak created a designated public forum for political ads by accepting them in the past under the same policy, and then impermissibly discriminated against Lebron. This case presents the opportunity to clarify that public forum analysis must look to the objective characteristics and practices of the government forum, rather than merely accepting *post hoc* government rationales.

Second, the panel erred in concluding that Amtrak had not engaged in viewpoint discrimination, where it simultaneously permitted the display of conservative political ads, and where Amtrak's policy permitted the display of commercial viewpoints on the same subject matter addressed by Lebron's noncommercial ad. This analysis conflicts with two decisions of this Court holding that bans on "religious" speech constitute viewpoint discrimination where nonreligious speech on the same subject matter is permitted;[13] and with decisions of the

---

[12] *United States v. Kokinda*, 497 U.S. 720, 737-38 (1990) (Kennedy, J., concurring); *id.* at 740 (Brennan, Marshall, Stevens, Blackmun, JJ., dissenting); *International Soc'y for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee*, 505 U.S. 672, 695 (1992) (Kennedy, Blackmun, Stevens, Souter, JJ., concurring in the judgment).

[13] *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995); *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.*, 508 U.S. 384 (1993).

First, Seventh, Tenth and Eleventh Circuits, finding viewpoint discrimination in similar circumstances.[14] In particular, the decision conflicts with a Seventh Circuit decision that invalidated a policy against "political" advertising virtually identical to that which the Second Circuit upheld.[15]

Third, the panel's holding that Amtrak's policy against "political" advertising was not vague conflicts directly with *Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell*, 425 U.S. 610 (1976). *Hynes* declared a policy restricting solicitation for "political" causes to be impermissibly vague because "political" was undefined, yet the Second Circuit upheld the same undefined term.

I. The Court of Appeals' Refusal to Consider Objective Evidence of Amtrak's Past Display of Political Advertising in Penn Station to Assess the Nature of the Forum Conflicts With Decisions of this Court and Several Circuits

The panel's decision illustrates the necessity for clarification of a fundamental issue in public forum doctrine: namely, what evidence to consider in determining the nature of a forum (*i.e.*, whether it is a public, designated, or nonpublic forum). By accepting Amtrak's *post hoc* assertions over contrary evidence of Amtrak's prior administration of its policy, arbitrarily confining its analysis to one particular billboard, and ignoring the physical characteristics of Penn Station, the panel applied a public forum doctrine that does little more than rubber-stamp the government's assertion regarding the forum.

---

[14] *Gay Lesbian Bisexual Alliance v. Pryor*, 110 F.3d 1543 (11th Cir. 1997); *Church on the Rock v. City of Albuquerque*, 84 F.3d 1273 (10th Cir. 1996); *Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Department of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144, 1159 (7th Cir. 1995); *AIDS Action Comm. v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth.*, 42 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 1994).

[15] *Air Line Pilots Ass'n*, 45 F.3d at 1159.

The facts as found by the district court are not disputed: Amtrak repeatedly displayed noncommercial, political advertisements in Penn Station, including a five-year ad immediately in front of the Spectacular for *The Plain Truth*, a noncommercial magazine addressing social and political issues from a conservative fundamentalist perspective. By Amtrak's own account, one substantive policy governed all advertising in Penn Station, including the Spectacular. Through its practice of permitting political ads under this policy, therefore, Amtrak created a designated public forum for political ads and discriminated when it refused to display Lebron's ad. Yet the panel majority ignored this evidence and held that the Spectacular was a nonpublic forum, or at most a designated forum only for commercial ads. App., *infra*, 11a.

The panel initially justified its refusal to consider any practice or evidence beyond the particular Spectacular billboard by its "finding" that there were two policies, and by noting that Lebron sought access to the Spectacular in particular. But as the panel conceded on rehearing, there is only one policy for all of Penn Station advertising. Accordingly, even if the forum is properly limited to the Spectacular, determination of whether it is a public, designated, or nonpublic forum requires consideration of Amtrak's implementation of its policy throughout Penn Station, since the same substantive policy governed the Spectacular and all Penn Station advertising. Pursuant to that policy, any ad that appeared in the rest of Penn Station—including the *Plain Truth* ad—could have appeared on the Spectacular, and therefore that evidence must be considered in determining the legal nature of the Spectacular forum.

The panel's decision to consider Amtrak's practice only with regard to one billboard rather than to consider the implementation of its advertising policy throughout Penn Station conflicts with the Seventh Circuit's decision in *Air Line Pilots Ass'n*. The union that challenged the policy against political advertising in that case sought to display an anti-United Air-

lines ad only in O'Hare Airport's Concourse B (the concourse serving United Airlines.) Yet the Seventh Circuit did not limit its inquiry to the specific billboard or concourse to which the union sought access, but instead considered all concourse advertising at the airport. *Air Line Pilots Ass'n*, 45 F.3d at 1151-52. *See also* App., *infra*, 20a.

The panel's acceptance of Amtrak's *post hoc* policy assertion over contrary prior practice conflicts with decisions of this Court and several circuits which have insisted on the importance of considering objective evidence of practice rather than *post hoc* assertions of policy. In *Grace Bible Fellowship, Inc. v. Maine Sch. Admin. Dist. #5*, 941 F.2d 45, 47 (1st Cir. 1991), the First Circuit, in a decision joined by then-Judge Breyer, stressed that "actual practice speaks louder than words" in public forum analysis, and looked to prior uses of a school's facilities to determine that those facilities were a designated public forum. In *Stewart v. District of Columbia Armory Bd.*, 863 F.2d 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1988), the District of Columbia Circuit similarly underscored the importance of past speech practices and the compatibility of plaintiffs' speech with the forum, noting that "it is from such objective factual indicia that the real intent [to create a designated forum] is often inferred even when expressed intent runs counter." 863 F.2d at 1019.[16]

---

[16] *See also Perry Educ. Ass'n v. Perry Local Educ. Ass'n*, 460 U.S. 37, 47 (1983) ("[i]f by policy *or by practice*" the school had opened the forum, it would create a designated public forum) (emphasis added); *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Educ. Fund, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 788, 802 (1985) ("the Court has looked to the policy and practice of the government to ascertain" whether it created a designated public forum); *Concerned Women for America, Inc. v. Lafayette Cty.*, 883 F.2d 32, 33-34 (5th Cir. 1989) (looking to library's past practices to override asserted policy against use of public library for political or religious purposes); *Paulsen v. County of Nassau*, 925 F.2d 65, 70 (2d Cir. 1991) ("[o]bjective indicia of intent to create a public forum, combined with a history of consistent practice, can overcome a bare statement of contrary purpose").

As Justice Kennedy has observed, "[i]f our public forum jurisprudence is to retain vitality, we must recognize that certain objective characteristics of Government property and its customary use by the public may control the case." *United States v. Kokinda*, 497 U.S. 720, 737-38 (1990) (Kennedy, J., concurring); *see also International Soc'y for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee*, 505 U.S. 672, 695 (1992) (Kennedy, Blackmun, Stevens, Souter, JJ., concurring in judgment) ("the [public forum] inquiry must be an objective one, based on the actual, physical characteristics and uses of the property").

The relevant past practice that the panel ignored revealed that *under the same policy* Amtrak had for five years leased advertising space immediately in front of the Spectacular to *The Plain Truth*, and also had displayed ads for such entities as the New York Department of the Environment and a muscular dystrophy foundation. Indeed, Amtrak had never before rejected an ad as "political" anywhere in Penn Station. And objective evidence of Amtrak's policy—a contract with its advertising agent, TDI—expressly provided for the display of public service and nonprofit ads.[17]

The need to look to such objective indicia is especially critical here, where Amtrak invoked an unwritten, undisseminated policy that it had never before relied upon to exclude similar speakers. The panel stressed that no political ads had been displayed on the Spectacular, but it failed to note that no one had ever sought to display a political ad there before Lebron. The evidence the panel disregarded, by contrast, unambiguously demonstrated that every time anyone previously had sought to display political ads under the same policy, Amtrak had permitted them to do so.

---

[17] Applying a novel and wholly unfounded standing doctrine, the panel reasoned that Lebron lacked "standing" to rely upon Amtrak's past display of political ads in Penn Station because he sought to display his ad in one particular billboard. App., *infra*, 16a. But as Amtrak conceded, and the panel implicitly admitted on rehearing, the same policy governed all Penn Station advertising. App., *infra*, 3b.

The panel's refusal to acknowledge the relevance of Amtrak's practice of allowing political ads elsewhere in Penn Station under the same policy renders the public forum doctrine toothless. Under the panel's approach, a public school that had permitted outside Protestant and Catholic groups to use meeting rooms on its second floor could deny a Jewish group access to a larger first floor room by asserting a policy against any outside groups using school rooms. If the first floor room had not previously been used by outside groups, the school's decision would be upheld, even though other religious groups had been granted access to other rooms under the same policy. Discrimination can always be made to look neutral by narrowing the scope of analysis to ignore instances of different treatment. *See* App., *infra*, 21a, 22a-23a, (Newman, Ch.J., dissenting).

The panel also ignored physical characteristics of Penn Station that support finding a designated public forum. The publicly-owned Penn Station is a major thoroughfare and underground mall for hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers everyday. In addition to the political ads already enumerated, Amtrak has permitted all sorts of political speech in Penn Station. Copies of the noncommercial, political magazine *The Plain Truth* have been distributed freely from its advertising kiosk for years. Under the "Free Speech" access policy, anyone may receive a permit to distribute leaflets and express political points of view. News agents and booksellers advertise and sell books and magazines with political points of view throughout the station. And Amtrak has never had a complaint about political speech of any kind in the station. Thus, political speech is clearly compatible with Penn Station's other uses, in the same way political speech is compatible with a downtown sidewalk. In fact, the only thing that distinguishes the Penn Station thoroughfare from a downtown sidewalk is that it is underground.

Had the panel examined Amtrak's objective practices in administering its policy stationwide rather than deferring

to its *post hoc* justification and narrowly focusing on the Spectacular, it would have concluded that Amtrak had created a designated public forum. This Court should grant certiorari to make clear that courts may not ignore objective evidence and past practice under the same asserted policy in determining the nature of a public forum.[18]

II. The Panel's Decision that Amtrak's Policy Is Viewpoint-Neutral Conflicts with Decisions of This Court and Other Circuits

The court of appeals correctly recognized that government must be viewpoint-neutral in allocating speech access to its property even in a nonpublic forum,[19] but erred in finding that Amtrak's rejection of Lebron's ad as "political" was viewpoint-neutral. The panel's decision in this respect conflicts with decisions of this Court and several Circuits.

First, in light of Amtrak's prior display of political ads under the same policy, the panel's decision conflicts with decisions of the First and Tenth Circuits holding that government may not use viewpoint grounds to depart from past practice in allocating access to a nonpublic forum. In *AIDS*

---

[18] The panel majority's failure to consider the physical characteristics and prior uses of Penn Station and its advertising also creates a conflict with this Court's plurality decision in *International Soc'y of Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee*, 505 U.S. at 690-91. In that case, the Court held that a restriction on leafleting was not "reasonable in light of the purposes of the forum" because there was no evidence that leafleting would cause any disruption of the airport's other uses. Here, had the panel considered the evidence showing that prior political speech in Penn Station had never created a problem, it should have found Amtrak's policy unreasonable, just as the Court did in *Lee*. The only reason the panel gave for the policy—avoiding the appearance of favoring some political views—simply cannot be squared with the fact that Amtrak has for years allowed the display of political ads and has permitted other political speech in Penn Station, including even solicitation for political causes, without any adverse effects.

[19] *Lamb's Chapel*, 508 U.S. at 394.

Action Comm. v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth., 42 F.3d 1, 11 (1st Cir. 1994), the First Circuit held that the MBTA engaged in viewpoint discrimination when it refused to display AIDS ads on the ground that it was sexually explicit when it had previously displayed an equally sexually explicit ad for the movie *Fatal Instinct*. Similarly, in *Church on the Rock v. City of Albuquerque*, 84 F.3d 1273, 1277-1279 (10th Cir. 1996), the Tenth Circuit held that a senior citizen center's refusal to show a religious film based on a policy prohibiting "sectarian instruction and religious worship" was viewpoint discriminatory where the center previously allowed a number of classes in which religion or religious matters were "the primary focus."

In contrast to these decisions, the panel here treated as viewpoint-neutral Amtrak's rejection of Lebron's ad as "political," even though Amtrak had for five years displayed political ads for *The Plain Truth* immediately in front of the Spectacular.[20]

Second, even putting aside Amtrak's prior display of political ads, the panel's decision conflicts with recent decisions of this Court and two Circuits holding that policies denying access on the basis of perspectives rather than subject matter are viewpoint-based. In *Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Department of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144, 1159 (7th Cir. 1995), the Seventh Circuit held that a virtually identical policy against "political" advertising in O'Hare Airport would constitute viewpoint

---

[20] In the lower courts, defendants' attorneys characterized Lebron's ad as a "political attack ad," and sought to distinguish the other political ads Amtrak displayed on that basis. Defendants' attorneys never explained how one might distinguish a "political attack" ad from a "political" ad, much less how one could do so in a constitutional manner. But more importantly, even if one could in theory draw a coherent distinction between the two, Amtrak's asserted policy draws no such distinction, but simply bans "political" ads. Nor did any of Amtrak's employees draw such a distinction. The government's action must of course stand or fall on its own terms, not on terms made up by its attorneys after the fact.

discrimination if "the proposed [advertisement] dealt with a subject that was 'otherwise permissible' in a given forum." There is no dispute that the subject matter of Lebron's ad—whether to buy Coors beer—was otherwise permissible under Amtrak's policy. Coors could have displayed an ad urging people to buy its beer, and Anheuser-Busch could have displayed an ad urging people to forgo Coors beer for Budweiser. Amtrak's sole objection to Lebron's ad was that he urged viewers not to buy Coors beer *for political reasons*.[21]

The Seventh Circuit's decision is consistent with this Court's decision in *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.*, 508 U.S. 384 (1993), and *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the Univ. of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995), which invalidated as viewpoint-based policies barring "religious" speech where the government supported nonreligious speech addressing the same subject matter. In *Rosenberger*, the Court expressly rejected the "assertion that no viewpoint discrimination occurs because the Guidelines discriminate against an entire class of viewpoints," reasoning that "[i]t is as objectionable to exclude both a theistic and an atheistic perspective on the debate as it is to exclude one, the other, or yet another political, economic, or social viewpoint." *Id.* at 831. If excluding all "religious" views on an otherwise includible subject is viewpoint discrimination, so is Amtrak's exclusion of "political" views on the includible subject of whether to buy a product.

The panel declined to follow *Lamb's Chapel* and *Rosenberger*, and instead purported to follow *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298 (1974). App., *infra*, 15a-16a

---

[21] Similarly, in *Gay Lesbian Bisexual Alliance v. Pryor*, 110 F.3d 1543, 1549 (11th Cir. 1997), the Eleventh Circuit held that a university's refusal to fund a gay and lesbian student group based on a statute that prohibited funding for groups that promoted "a lifestyle or actions prohibited by the sodomy and sexual misconduct laws," was "blatant viewpoint discrimination" where the law permitted funding of groups which promoted compliance with the sodomy or sexual misconduct laws.

and n.4. In *Lehman*, a plurality upheld a policy against partisan political advertising on the interiors of municipal buses. But *Lehman* did not address whether the policy it upheld was viewpoint-based in the sense that this Court used that concept twenty years later in *Lamb's Chapel* and *Rosenberger*.[22] In fact, the panel's reliance on *Lehman* to find Amtrak's policy viewpoint-neutral conflicts sharply with *Lamb's Chapel* and *Rosenberger*.

The Court should grant certiorari to resolve whether government may exclude speech from a forum as "political" where it accepts speech that addresses the same subject matter from other perspectives.

III. The Panel's Decision that Amtrak's Policy is Not Unconstitutionally Vague Conflicts with This Court's Decision in *Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell*

According to the district court's findings—none of which Amtrak challenged—the meaning of Amtrak's ban on "political" advertisements was a mystery to everyone responsible for enforcing it. App., *infra*, 17c.

Even Anthony DeAngelo, the Amtrak official with ultimate responsibility for Amtrak's advertising policy, could not offer a coherent definition of it: "at times [he] indicated that the policy prohibited only those advertisements that were both 'political' *and* divisive or objectionable; at other times, he stated that the policy prohibited all advertisements that were not devoted to the selling of a product or service." App., *infra*, 17c. Another Amtrak official, who reviews advertising material submitted for the Spectacular, "knew that there was a policy barring 'political' advertisements, but he could not really say what such a policy meant." *Id.* The policy "was not even known to many of those responsible for billboard advertising." App., *infra*, 16c. And notwithstanding the

---

[22] As detailed below, the policy upheld in *Lehman* was significantly different from Amtrak's. *See infra* section III.

asserted unwritten policy against political advertising, written standards in the TDI-Amtrak contract governing Penn Station advertising expressly *permitted* noncommercial public service ads. App., *infra*, 19c.

Under this Court's decisions in *Hynes* and *City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.*, 486 U.S. 750 (1988), such a policy is unconstitutionally vague. In *Hynes*, the Court held that a law requiring persons soliciting for a "political . . . cause" to obtain permits was unconstitutionally vague because the law did not define "political" cause. 425 U.S. at 621-22. *Hynes* is controlling here, as Amtrak relies on the same undefined term, and has not even put its policy in writing. *See also Air Line Pilots Ass'n*, 45 F.3d at 1154 n.7 ("the content of the word 'political' is not immediately obvious . . . . [It] is not self-defining"); *id.* at 1162 (Flaum, J., concurring) ("the very terms 'political' or 'nonpartisan' are themselves insusceptible of principled application") (citation omitted).

In *Lakewood*, the Court held that a policy governing access to newsboxes on public property gave the mayor "unfettered discretion," and was therefore unconstitutional. 486 U.S. at 772. The unwritten and undefined character of Amtrak's policy affords Amtrak officials similarly unguided discretion; DeAngelo said he offers his employees no instruction in the policy, and expects them to apply their "common sense." A359-60, A362-65, A386-88.

The panel upheld Amtrak's policy by likening it to the policy upheld in *Lehman*. App., *infra*, 14a. But there are two fundamental flaws in that reasoning. First, *Lehman* did not even address a vagueness claim. Second, Amtrak's policy is substantially more open-ended than the policy upheld in *Lehman*. The *Lehman* policy was in writing, and had been authoritatively construed by the Ohio Supreme Court to limit advertising space to " '[p]urveyors of goods and services saleable in commerce.' " 418 U.S. at 303-04 (*quoting Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 34 Ohio St.2d 143, 146, 296 N.E.2d 683,

685 (1973)). In addition, there was "uncontradicted testimony at the trial that during the 26 years of public operation, the Shaker Heights system . . . had not accepted or permitted *any* political or public issue advertising on its vehicles." *Id.* at 300-01.[23]

By contrast, Amtrak's policy is unwritten, undefined, contrary to its own written standards, and has been inconsistently applied. Amtrak's policy is as different from the written, consistently-applied, and authoritatively-construed policy upheld in *Lehman* as were the policies this Court invalidated in *Hynes* and *Lakewood*. The Court should grant certiorari to resolve the confusion created by the Second Circuit's misguided reliance on *Lehman*.

---

[23] In addition, *Lehman* rested on a captive audience rationale not applicable here. The Court in *Lehman* was unable to obtain a majority opinion, and the narrowest opinion upholding the result was that of Justice Douglas, who based his opinion on the fact that riders on the bus were a "captive audience," and that speakers have no right to address a captive audience. 418 U.S. at 308 (Douglas, J., concurring). Since then, the Court has restricted the "captive audience" rationale to settings in which there is a substantial intrusion on privacy. *Erznoznik v. City of Jacksonville*, 422 U.S. 205, 209-10 n.5 (1975).

In a host of cases challenging restrictive municipal transportation facility advertising policies, *Lehman* has virtually always been distinguished, either on grounds that facially similar policies had not been consistently applied, or that the "captive audience" rationale was inapplicable. *See, e.g., Air Line Pilots Ass'n*, 45 F.3d at 1153 (*Lehman* inapplicable where policy not consistently applied); *Planned Parenthood Ass'n v. Chicago Transit Auth.*, 767 F.2d 1225, 1232-33 (7th Cir. 1985) (same); *Lebron v. Washington Metropolitan Transit Auth.*, 749 F.2d 893, 896 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (*Lehman* distinguished because transit authority had accepted political ads in the past); *Hevesi v. Metropolitan Transp. Auth.*, 827 F. Supp. 1069 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (same); *U.S. Southwest Africa/Namibia Trade & Cultural Council v. United States*, 708 F.2d 760, 767 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (distinguishing ads in bus interiors from ads in airport because "[a] person in the airports' concourses or walkways who considers an advertisement . . . objectionable enjoys the freedom simply to walk away that a passenger on a bus does not"); *Penthouse Int'l, Ltd. v. Koch*, 599 F. Supp. 1338, 1347 (S.D.N.Y. 1984) (ads posted in "open public areas of the subway stations" do not implicate "captive audience" concerns).

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID D. COLE
Counsel of Record
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 662-9078

GLORIA C. PHARES
JEFFREY H. BLUM
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB & TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 336-2000

R. BRUCE RICH
BERNADETTE M. MCCANN EZRING
JONATHAN BLOOM
MARC BROTMAN
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153
(212) 310-8000

April 1998

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 1494—August Term, 1994

(Argued: April 27, 1993 Decided: December 27, 1993

Reversed and Remanded: February 21, 1995

Reargued: May 11, 1995 Decided: October 30, 1995)

Docket No. 93-7127

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellee,

—vs.—

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Defendant-Appellant,

—and—

TRANSPORTATION DISPLAYS, INCORPORATED,

Defendant-Counter-Claimant.

Before:

NEWMAN, *Chief Judge*, and
LUMBARD and MAHONEY, *Circuit Judges*.

On remand from the United States Supreme Court, *see Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 115 S. Ct. 961 (1995), appeal from a judgment entered February 11, 1993 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Pierre N. Leval, then-*District Judge*, that enjoined defendant-appellee National Railroad Passenger Corporation to display a political advertisement prepared by plaintiff-counter-defendant-appellee Michael A. Lebron on a large billboard known as the Spectacular in New York City's Pennsylvania Station, the district court having determined that Amtrak's failure to do so violated the First Amendment. *See Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (AMTRAK)*, 811 F. Supp. 993 (S.D.N.Y. 1993).

We initially reversed on the ground that Amtrak is not a governmental actor subject to the strictures of the First Amendment. *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. AMTRAK)*, 12 F.3d 388 (2d Cir. 1993). The Supreme Court reversed and remanded, but left open the question whether Amtrak's conduct violated the First Amendment. 115 S. Ct. at 974-75. We now conclude that Amtrak's historical refusal to accept political advertisements such as Lebron's on the Spectacular is a reasonable use of that forum that is neutral as to viewpoint, and that Lebron lacks standing to assert a facial challenge to Amtrak's general policies concerning the acceptance of advertising for display at Pennsylvania Station.

Reversed. Chief Judge Newman dissents in a separate opinion.

KEVIN T. BAINE, Washington, D.C. (Nicole K. Seligman, Steven M. Farina, Williams & Connolly, Washington, D.C., William G. Ballaine, Mark S. Landman, Siff Rosen P.C., New York, New York, of counsel), *for Defendant-Appellant.*

DAVID D. COLE, Washington, D.C. (Center for Constitutional Rights, Washington, D.C., R. Bruce Rich, Gloria C. Phares, Robin E. Silverman, Bernadette M. McCann Ezring, Jonathan Bloom, Weil, Gotshal & Manges, New York, New York, of counsel), *for Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellee.*

MAHONEY, *Circuit Judge*:

On remand from the United States Supreme Court, *see Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 115 S. Ct. 961 (1995) ("*Lebron III*"), this appeal of a judgment entered February 11, 1993 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Pierre N. Leval, then-*District Judge*,* again comes before us. The district court enjoined defendant-appellee National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("Amtrak") and defendant-counter-claimant Transportation Displays, Incorporated ("TDI") to display a political advertisement prepared by plaintiff-counter-defendant-appellee Michael A. Lebron on a large billboard known as the Spectacular in New York City's Pennsylvania Station ("Penn Station"), having determined that Amtrak's failure to do so violated the First Amendment. *See Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (AMTRAK)*, 811 F. Supp. 993 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) ("*Lebron I*").

On appeal, after staying the injunction, we reversed the judgment of the district court, "conclud[ing] that Amtrak is not a governmental actor subject to the strictures of the First Amendment." *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (AMTRAK)*, 12 F.3d 388, 389 (2d Cir. 1993) ("*Lebron II*"). The Supreme Court reversed and remanded, holding that Amtrak "is part of the Government for purposes of the First Amendment,"

---

* Judge Leval became a member of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals on November 8, 1993.

Lebron III, 115 S. Ct. at 974-75, but "express[ing] no opinion as to whether Amtrak's refusal to display Lebron's advertisement violated that Amendment." *Id.* at 975.

Because we conclude that Amtrak's historical refusal to accept political advertisements such as Lebron's on the Spectacular is a reasonable use of that forum that is neutral as to viewpoint, and that Lebron lacks standing to assert a facial challenge to Amtrak's general policies concerning the acceptance of advertising for display at Pennsylvania Station, we again reverse the judgment of the district court.

Background

On November 30, 1992, Lebron, an artist who creates political billboard displays (frequently involving commentary on public issues), and TDI, which manages the leasing of advertising space for Amtrak, entered into a leasing agreement (the "Lease") under which Lebron would rent the Spectacular, "a curved back-lit display space approximately 103 feet wide by ten feet high . . . [which] dominates the west wall of the rotunda on the upper level of Penn Station where thousands of passengers pass each day," for the months of January and February 1993. *Lebron II*, 12 F.3d at 389. Although Lebron did not specify the precise nature of his display, he did inform TDI that his work was generally political. *Id.* By the terms of the Lease, " '[a]ll advertising copy is subject to approval of TDI and [Amtrak] as to character, text, illustration, design and operation. . . . [I]f [Amtrak] should deem such advertising objectionable for any reason, TDI shall have the right to terminate the contract and discontinue the service without notice.' " *Id.* (quoting the Lease, alterations partially added).

Lebron then submitted his proposed advertisement (the "Display") to TDI. Lebron characterizes the Display as "an allegory about the destructive influence of a powerful, urban, materialistic and individualistic culture on rural, community

based, family-oriented and religious cultures." The district court described the Display as follows:

> The work is a photomontage, accompanied by considerable text. Taking off on a widely circulated Coors beer advertisement which proclaims Coors to be the "Right Beer," Lebron's piece is captioned "Is it the Right's Beer Now?" It includes photographic images of convivial drinkers of Coors beer, juxtaposed with a Nicaraguan village scene in which peasants are menaced by a can of Coors that hurtles towards them, leaving behind a tail of fire, as if it were a missile. The accompanying text, appearing on either end of the montage, criticizes the Coors family for its support of right-wing causes, particularly the contras in Nicaragua. Again taking off on Coors' advertising which uses the slogan of "Silver Bullet" for its beer cans, the text proclaims that Coors is "The Silver Bullet that aims The Far Right's political agenda at the heart of America."

Lebron I, 811 F. Supp. at 995.

When TDI saw the Display, it offered Lebron any of 500 alternative billboard sites that TDI had available in New York City (none of which were in Penn Station), but Lebron rejected this offer. Echoing the allegation in his complaint that the Spectacular is "a unique advertising location in the City of New York," Lebron stated in an affidavit that:

> The very size of the Spectacular allowed me to design and visualize this work with an effectiveness and clarity that would have been otherwise impossible to achieve. Its size and shape make it one of the largest advertising display spaces in New York City, and its prominent location in Pennsylvania Station means that it is visible to a large segment of the traveling public, providing an excellent opportunity to reach exactly the kind of audience I hope to engage with the subject matter of this

> piece. For all of these reasons, I consider the space an extraordinarily unique advertising location in New York City, and a unique challenge to my communicative skills as an artist that no gallery and few other public environments could provide.

Shortly thereafter, Amtrak rejected the Display, stating that its " 'policy is that it will not allow political advertising on the [S]pectacular advertising sign.' " *Lebron II*, 12 F.3d at 389 (quoting Amtrak rejection letter, alteration in *Lebron II*).

This policy, however, is not committed to writing. *Lebron I*, 811 F. Supp. at 1001, although the licensing agreement between Amtrak and TDI (which is addressed to all of Amtrak's advertising space) states that: " 'All advertising material, exhibit material, notices and advertisements, and their manner of presentation and design, shall be subject to approval by Amtrak, which may disapprove any such items at its own discretion.' " *Id.* at 1002 (quoting licensing agreement).[1] In addition, the licensing agreement provides that public service announcements may be accepted, at a reduced rate and when space is available, although they may be preempted by commercial advertising. *Id.* at 1003. Public service advertisements may be accepted only from " 'recognized, legitimate [tax exempt] not-for-profit organizations, corporations, National, State or Local government agencies and subdivisions, philanthropic or cultural organizations whose activities would be of interest or benefit to a majority of the area population,' " and must "adhere to 'good taste, decency and community standards.' " *Id.* (quoting licensing agreement, alterations in *Lebron I*).

---

[1] The licensing agreements between Amtrak's predecessor, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company ("PRC"), and TDI provided that the PRC could refuse any advertisement that it deemed " 'unlawful, immoral, improper or offensive to good taste . . . or [to] involve *political* or other views which could result in dissension or [to] involve [PRC] in dissension, complaints or controversy with its patrons or the public.' " *Lebron I*, 811 F. Supp. at 1001-02 (quoting PRC-TDI licensing agreements) (alterations partially added, emphasis added). However, this language has been superseded by the language quoted in the text of this opinion.

In this regard, Amtrak has leased advertising space to various noncommercial groups, including:

> the New York Department of the Environment, the New York Department of Commerce, a foundation for muscular dystrophy, and *Plain Truth* Magazine, a free magazine on political and social issues published by The Worldwide Church of God. In addition, testimony of the general counsel of TDI indicates that TDI regularly displays public service advertisements, including subjects such as the homeless, the environment, drunk driving, AIDS awareness, health issues, and race relations.

Id. at 1004. *The Plain Truth* is distributed at a four-sided, seven-foot kiosk that displays an advertisement for the magazine and is located in front of the Spectacular.

In addition, however, it is undisputed that in the twenty-six years of its existence, the Spectacular has never been used for any type of advertising other than commercial promotions. The only advertisements that have appeared on the Spectacular have promoted DuPont Company, Resorts International in Atlantic City, the Broadway play "Sophisticated Ladies," Fujitsu Computers, Nike athletic wear, and A & S Department Stores.[2] Moreover, as Lebron has acknowledged, Amtrak previews proposed advertisements for the Spectacular, while it views advertisements to be used at other locations only after they are exhibited.

Lebron commenced this action alleging a violation of his First Amendment rights and breach of contract, and seeking equitable relief or, alternatively, damages. The district court granted a mandatory injunction requiring Amtrak and TDI to exhibit the Display on the Spectacular. *Lebron I*, 811 F. Supp. at 1005. After holding that Amtrak is a government actor subject to the First Amendment, *id.* at 995-1000, the court con-

---

[2] The stated twenty-six years of the Spectacular's existence, and the list of advertisers over that period, is premised upon the record presented on this appeal, which was completed over two years ago.

cluded that Amtrak's refusal to exhibit the Display violated that amendment. *Id.* at 1000-05. The court provided four bases for this determination: (1) Amtrak's policy of not accepting political advertisements is not clearly set forth, in that it is not reduced to writing, *id.* at 1001-02; (2) the policy is vague, in that it is difficult to draw the line between political, public interest, and commercial advertisements, as demonstrated by conflicting testimony by Amtrak's officials, *id.* at 1002-03; (3) the policy is not consistently applied, in that certain public service advertisements that Amtrak has accepted might be viewed as political, *id.* at 1003-04; and (4) the policy may be void as discriminating on the basis of viewpoint, in that Amtrak may inquire into whether a particular advertisement is offensive, *id.* at 1004-05.

As previously stated, we initially reversed on the ground that Amtrak is not subject to First Amendment constraints, and therefore did not consider the merits of Lebron's First Amendment claim. *Lebron II*, 12 F.3d at 392. We instructed the district court not to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claim, but noted that Lebron would be free to pursue that claim in state court. *Id.* at 392-93. The Supreme Court reversed and remanded on the "government actor" issue, directing us to consider the merits of Lebron's First Amendment claim. *Lebron III*, 115 S. Ct. at 974-75.

We requested supplemental letter briefs from the parties, and heard reargument on the First Amendment issues.

Discussion

Because Lebron seeks access to government property, we begin with a review of the public forum doctrine.

> Under this approach, regulation of speech on government property that has traditionally been available for public expression is subject to the highest scrutiny. Such regulations survive only if they are narrowly drawn to achieve

> a compelling state interest. *Perry [Educ. Ass'n v. Perry Local Educators' Ass'n]*, 460 U.S. [37,] 45, 103 S. Ct. [948,] 955 [(1983)]. The second category of public property is the designated public forum, whether of a limited or unlimited character—property that the state has opened for expressive activity by part or all of the public. *Ibid.* Regulation of such property is subject to the same limitations as that governing a traditional public forum. *Id.*, at 46, 103 S. Ct., at 955. Finally, there is all remaining public property. Limitations on expressive activity conducted on this last category of property must survive only a much more limited review. The challenged regulation need only be reasonable, as long as the regulation is not an effort to suppress the speaker's activity due to disagreement with the speaker's view. *Ibid.*

International Soc'y for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee, 112 S. Ct. 2701, 2705-06 (1992). Reasonable, content-neutral time, place, or manner restrictions are permissible in a public forum. *See Ward v. Rock Against Racism*, 491 U.S. 781, 791 (1989).

"[I]n defining the forum [the Supreme Court has] focused on the *access sought by the speaker*. . . . In cases in which limited access is sought, [the Court's] cases have taken a more tailored approach to ascertaining the perimeters of a forum within the confines of the government property." *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense and Educ. Fund, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 788, 801 (1985) (emphasis added) (holding that federal fund-raising drive, not federal workplace generally, was relevant forum for analysis).

Amtrak contends that our public forum inquiry must focus on the Spectacular alone, rather than all Penn Station advertising space. We agree. Because of its unique size, location, and visibility, Lebron sought access only to the Spectacular, and refused to accept any other advertising space in New York City managed by TDI. Although Lebron now contends that we should broaden our public forum inquiry to all Penn Station advertising space, it was he who determined that only the Spectacular would be acceptable for his display. *Cf. Air Line*

Pilots Ass'n, Int'l v. Department of Aviation, 45 F.3d 1144, 1151-52 (7th Cir. 1995) (where speaker seeks access to diorama display cases in airport, public forum inquiry focuses on display cases rather than airport as a whole); *Hubbard Broadcasting, Inc. v. Metropolitan Sports Facilities Comm'n*, 797 F.2d 552, 555-56 (8th Cir.) (where speaker seeks access to advertising space in sports arena, public forum inquiry focuses on advertising space rather than entire arena), *cert denied*, 479 U.S. 986 (1986).

To determine the Spectacular's forum category, we must examine "the policy and practice of the government to ascertain whether it intended to designate a place not traditionally open to assembly and debate as a public forum." *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 802. We must bear in mind that "[t]he government does not create a public forum by inaction or by permitting limited discourse, but only by intentionally opening a nontraditional forum for public discourse." *Id.*; *see also Krishna*, 112 S. Ct. at 2706 (quoting *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 802). Thus, even when the government opens a forum for some speech, the forum does not become a public forum if the government did not intend to open the forum without limitation. *See United States v. Kokinda*, 497 U.S. 720, 730 (1990) (plurality opinion); *Perry Educ. Ass'n v. Perry Local Educators Ass'n*, 460 U.S. 37, 48 (1983). When only some First Amendment access has been granted, the reasonableness test applies. *Kokinda*, 497 U.S. at 730 (plurality opinion); *Perry*, 460 U.S. at 49.

Although Amtrak does not maintain a written policy with respect to the Spectacular, its practice is clear; it has never opened the Spectacular for anything except purely commercial advertising. *See Air Line Pilots Ass'n*, 45 F.3d at 1154 ("a court must examine the *actual* policy - as gleaned from the *consistent* practice with regard to various speakers - to determine whether a state intended to create a designated public forum"); *cf. AIDS Action Comm. v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth.*, 42 F.3d 1, 10-12 (1st Cir. 1994) (prohibiting advertisements concerning

use of condoms pursuant to written policy prohibiting sexually explicit advertisements constituted "discrimination in the application of supposedly neutral standards" when other sexually explicit advertisements had been allowed).

In light of Amtrak's undisputed practice with respect to the Spectacular, therefore, we conclude that the Spectacular is not a public forum; most likely, it is a nonpublic forum, or perhaps it is a limited public forum opened for purely commercial speech. *See Calash v. City of Bridgeport*, 788 F.2d 80, 83-84 (2d Cir. 1986) (sports arena opened only to civic, charitable, and nonprofit groups either a nonpublic forum or a limited public forum not required to accommodate other members of general public).

Accordingly, Amtrak's policy of excluding noncommercial advertisements from the Spectacular will be upheld so long as the policy is "viewpoint-neutral and reasonable in relation to the forum's purpose." *Calash*, 788 F.2d at 84; *see also Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 806 ("Control over access to a nonpublic forum can be based on subject matter and speaker identity so long as the distinctions drawn are reasonable in light of the purpose served by the forum and are viewpoint neutral.").

Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, 418 U.S. 298 (1974), is particularly well addressed to this issue as presented in the instant case. In *Lehman*, the city imposed a ban on political advertisements in buses, but allowed other types of advertisements, including commercial and public service ads. A candidate for public office challenged this policy as a First Amendment violation, and the Court responded as follows:

> Here, we have no open spaces, no meeting hall, park, street corner, or other public thoroughfare. Instead, the city is engaged in commerce. It must provide rapid, convenient, pleasant, and inexpensive service to the commuters of Shaker Heights. The car card space, although incidental to the provision of public transportation, is part

of the commercial venture. In much the same way that a newspaper or periodical, or even a radio or television station, need not accept every proffer of advertising from the general public, a city transit system has discretion to develop and make reasonable choices concerning the type of advertising that may be displayed in its vehicles. In making these choices, this Court has held that a public utility "will be sustained in its protection of activities in public places when those activities do not interfere with the general public convenience, comfort and safety." *Public Utilities Comm'n v. Pollak*, 343 U.S. [451,] 464-65 [(1952)].

Because state action exists, however, the policies and practices governing access to the transit system's advertising space must not be arbitrary, capricious, or invidious. . . . Revenue earned from long-term commercial advertising could be jeopardized by a requirement that short-term candidacy or issue-oriented advertisements be displayed on car cards. Users would be subjected to the blare of political propaganda. There could be lurking doubts about favoritism, and sticky administrative problems might arise in parceling out limited space to eager politicians. In these circumstances, the managerial decision to limit car card space to innocuous and less controversial commercial and service oriented advertising does not rise to the dignity of a First Amendment violation. . . .

No First Amendment forum is here to be found. The city consciously has limited access to its transit system advertising space in order to minimize chances of abuse, the appearance of favoritism, and the risk of imposing upon a captive audience. These are reasonable legislative objectives advanced by the city *in a proprietary capacity*. In these circumstances, there is no First or Fourteenth Amendment violation.

Lehman, 418 U.S. at 303-04 (plurality opinion) (emphasis added).[3]

It is especially significant that, as in *Lehman*, Amtrak acts in this case in a proprietary capacity, rather than as a governmental regulator. As the Court stated in *Krishna*:

> Where the government is acting as a proprietor, managing its internal operations, rather than acting as lawmaker with the power to regulate or license, its action will not be subjected to the heightened review to which its actions as a lawmaker may be subject. *Kokinda, supra*, 497 U.S., at [725], 110 S. Ct., at [3119] (plurality opinion) (citing *Cafeteria & Restaurant Workers v. McElroy*, 367 U.S. 886, 896, 81 S. Ct. 1743, 1749, 6 L.Ed.2d 1230 (1961)). Thus, we have upheld a ban on political advertisements in city-operated transit vehicles, *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298, 94 S. Ct. 2714, 41 L.Ed.2d 770

---

[3] Lebron contends that because the only government interest in *Lehman* that garnered the support of a majority of the Court is protecting captive audiences, the case must be read as so limited. However, the Supreme Court has repeatedly reaffirmed a broader reading of *Lehman*, often specifically citing to the plurality opinion. *See, e.g., Krishna*, 112 S. Ct. at 2705 ("we have upheld a ban on political advertisements in city-operated transit vehicles") (citing *Lehman*); *Kokinda*, 497 U.S. at 726 (plurality opinion) ("In *Lehman*, the plurality concluded that the ban on political advertisements (combined with the allowance of other advertisements) was permissible under [the arbitrary and capricious] standard") (followed by quotation from *Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 304) (plurality opinion); *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 806 ("a speaker may be excluded from a nonpublic forum if he wishes to address a topic not encompassed within the purpose of the forum") (citing *Lehman*); *Perry*, 460 U.S. at 47 ("[I]n [*Lehman*] (opinion of BLACKMUN, J.), a plurality of the Court concluded that a city transit system's rental of space in its vehicles for commercial advertising did not require it to accept partisan political advertising."); *see also Air Line Pilots Ass'n*, 45 F.3d at 1153 n.3 (declining "to limit *Lehman*'s holding to situations involving captive audiences"); *Calash*, 788 F.2d at 84 (citing *Lehman* plurality opinion for proposition that "rental of space to commercial advertisers does not require City to accept political advertising on buses"). We therefore see no need to address Amtrak's argument that its policy could be justified on the basis of the captive audience doctrine.

> (1974), even though the city permitted other types of advertising on those vehicles. Similarly, we have permitted a school district to limit access to an internal mail system used to communicate with teachers employed by the district. *Perry Education Assn. v. Perry Local Educators' Ass'n*, 460 U.S. 37, 103 S. Ct. 948, 74 L.Ed.2d 794 (1983).

112 S. Ct. at 2705.

Amtrak's decision, as a proprietor, to decline to enter the political arena, even indirectly, by displaying political advertisements is certainly reasonable. Amtrak's position as a government controlled and financed public facility, used daily by thousands of people, made it highly advisable to avoid the criticism and the embarrassments of allowing any display seeming to favor any political view. This was particularly so with respect to the Spectacular in view of its uniqueness and size. *Cf. Calash*, 788 F.2d at 84 (finding the city's decision to limit access to sports arena to civic, charitable, and nonprofit groups, but not rock musicians, reasonable) (citing *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 809-11); *Perry*, 460 U.S. at 50-53; and *Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 304 (plurality opinion)). Nor would a policy against "political" advertising on the Spectacular be void for vagueness in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 303-04 (plurality opinion).

Lebron urges us to reach the same conclusion as the district court, arguing that Amtrak's policy is unwritten, inconsistently applied, and possibly viewpoint biased. We disagree.

The fact that a policy is not committed to writing does not of itself constitute a First Amendment violation. *Cf. City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.*, 486 U.S. 750, 770 (1988) ("[T]he limits the city claims are implicit in its law must be made explicit by textual incorporation, binding judicial or administrative construction, or well-established practice."). *City of Lakewood* and the other cases cited by the district court stand for the propositions that "in the area of free expression a

licensing statute placing unbridled discretion in the hands of a government official or agency constitutes a prior restraint and may result in censorship," *id.* at 757, and that "the absence of express standards makes it difficult to distinguish, 'as applied,' between a licensor's legitimate denial of a permit and its illegitimate abuse of censorial power." *Id.* at 758.

Neither of these concerns is implicated here. Amtrak's prior written agreements, together with the testimony of the Amtrak official responsible for approving advertisements on the Spectacular and Amtrak's historic practice of reserving the Spectacular for commercial advertisements, dispel the notion that Amtrak enjoyed "unbridled discretion" or could have perpetrated an "illegitimate abuse of censorial power" in rejecting an advertisement because of its political content. Furthermore, because the policy against political advertisements was limited in scope to the Spectacular, there is no evidence that Amtrak's policy has ever been applied inconsistently.

The district court also intimated that Amtrak's policy might be void for viewpoint bias, depending upon which of the conflicting versions offered at trial represented Amtrak's true policy. Although the district court entered no findings of fact, its concern was primarily based upon statements appearing in Amtrak's 1967 and 1980 agreements with TDI, which gave Amtrak the discretion to refuse any advertising that "involve[s] political or other views which could result in dissension or involve [Amtrak] in dissension, complaints or controversy with its patrons or the public." 811 F. Supp. at 1001-02 (quoting TDI licensing agreements) (alterations partly added). Of course, if such a policy were used to screen out only controversial political advertisements—that is, political advertisements distasteful to the majority—it would be void for viewpoint bias. On the other hand, it seems more sensible to read the language as a justification, however inartfully phrased, for a categorical ban against political advertising, *see, e.g.*, *Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 304 (characterizing commercial advertising as "innocuous and less controversial" than political advertising), rather than as a test

for discriminating against certain types of political advertisements.[4]

Because we have found that Amtrak's policy against political advertisements was limited in scope to the Spectacular, Lebron's attempt to attack Amtrak's policies regarding the acceptance of advertisements in Penn Station generally, rather than on the Spectacular, amounts, in substance, to a facial challenge to those policies as they might be applied to advertisements other than Lebron's and to locations not at issue. Ordinary rules of standing, of course, would bar Lebron from mounting such a challenge. As the Supreme Court has made clear: "Embedded in the traditional rules governing constitutional adjudication is the principle that a person to whom a statute may constitutionally be applied will not be heard to challenge that statute on the ground that it may conceivably be applied unconstitutionally to others, in other situations not before the Court." *Broadrick v. Oklahoma*, 413 U.S. 601, 610 (1973) (collecting cases).

Further, "[t]he question of standing is not subject to waiver . . . : 'we are required to address the issue even if the courts below have not passed on it, and even if the parties fail to raise the issue before us. The federal courts are under an independent obligation to examine their own jurisdiction, and standing "is perhaps the most important of [the jurisdictional]

---

[4] Lebron invokes *Lamb's Chapel v. Central Moriches Union Free School District*, 113 S. Ct. 2141 (1993), which invalidated a ban on the showing of religiously oriented films in public schools when secularly oriented films on the identical subjects were permitted, to argue that Amtrak's policy violates viewpoint neutrality. Lebron perceives viewpoint discrimination because "[u]nder Amtrak's policy, the Coors Brewing Company could advertise and *encourage* purchase of its beer, but Lebron's critical treatment of the same subject matter, *discouraging* purchase of Coor's beer, was rejected because it expressed a 'political' point of view." The argument is plainly specious. The "subject matter" of the Display can hardly be described, with any remote sense of accuracy, as the merits or demerits of Coors Beer. As Lebron himself stated in an affidavit, "I do not seek to sell anything other than ideas with this advertisement."

doctrines." ' " *United States v. Hays*, 115 S. Ct. 2431, 2435 (1995) (quoting *FW/PBS, Inc. v. City of Dallas*, 493 U.S. 215, 230-31 (1990) (quoting *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 750 (1984))) (alteration in *FW/PBS*).

Broadrick also recognized, however, that "the Court has altered its traditional rules of standing to permit—in the First Amendment area—'attacks on overly broad statutes with no requirement that the person making the attack demonstrate that his own conduct could not be regulated by a statute drawn with the requisite narrow specificity.' " *Id.* at 612 (quoting *Dombrowski v. Pfister*, 380 U.S. 479, 486 (1965)). *Broadrick* went on to emphasize that this overbreadth doctrine "has been employed by the Court sparingly and only as a last resort." *Id.* at 613; *see also Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 52 (1971) ("Procedures for testing the constitutionality of a statute 'on its face' . . . are fundamentally at odds with the function of the federal courts in our constitutional plan.").

In our view, this case affords no occasion for application of the overbreadth doctrine, and Lebron accordingly lacks standing to assert a general challenge to Amtrak's advertising policies. The doctrine has only been applied to the conduct of the government in its role as a regulator, not as a proprietor. *See e.g.*, *City of Lakewood*, 486 U.S. at 759-62 (newspaper permitted to mount facial challenge to ordinance that granted municipal mayor uncircumscribed authority to allow or disallow distribution of newspapers via newsracks on public streets); *Board of Airport Comm'rs v. Jews for Jesus, Inc.*, 482 U.S. 569, 571, 574-77 (1987) (allowing overbreadth challenge to ordinance that barred "First Amendment activities within the Central Terminal Area at Los Angeles International Airport"). It is invoked against a statute that " 'threatens others not before the court - those who desire to engage in legally protected expression but who may refrain from doing so rather than risk prosecution or undertake to have the law declared partially invalid,' " *id.* at 574 (quoting *Brockett v. Spokane Arcades, Inc.*, 472 U.S. 491, 503 (1985)), and invalidation of a statute on

its face is permitted "only if the overbreadth is 'substantial.' " *Id.* (collecting cases).

Such concerns simply are not implicated by Amtrak's role as the proprietor of Penn Station, essentially seeking to derive revenues from the sale of advertising while minimizing interference with or disruption of the station's commercial function. *See Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 303 (plurality opinion). Thus, Lebron lacks standing to present a facial challenge to Amtrak's general advertising policies in this litigation. This would be so even if Lebron had adduced a stronger showing of erosion of Amtrak's policy against political advertisements than the handful of assertedly borderline cases that was presented in this litigation. As Chief Judge Newman pointed out in *Lebron II*, "Amtrak's billboard space in Pennsylvania Station, even if used in the past for ads of a public service nature, has not become a forum for ads of such pointed political content as Lebron's attack on the makers of Coors Beer for promoting 'The Far Right's political agenda.' " 12 F.3d at 394 (Newman, C.J., dissenting).

Conclusion

We reverse the judgment of the district court and remand with the instruction that the district court dismiss Lebron's complaint. As previously noted, *see Lebron II*, 12 F.3d at 392-393, Lebron is free to pursue his state law claim in state court.

JON O. NEWMAN, *Chief Judge*, dissenting:

Because I believe that Amtrak, a governmental entity now authoritatively determined to be subject to First Amendment limitations, *see Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 115 S. Ct. 961 (1995), has violated the First Amendment by its rejection of the political advertisement that Michael Lebron

contracted to display on a billboard in Penn Station, I respectfully dissent.

The Court's dismissal of Lebron's lawsuit rests on two premises, both of which, in my view, are flawed. The first concerns the identification of the forum for purposes of applying public forum analysis. The second concerns the standard for determining whether a governmental actor's policy for rejecting advertisements violates First Amendment requirements.

1. *The relevant forum.* The premise of the Court's identification of the relevant forum is that, in advertising cases, a court should consider the particular billboard on which an applicant wishes to display a message. Proceeding from this premise, the Court narrows its inquiry to "the Spectacular," the large billboard high on the west wall of the rotunda of the upper level of Penn Station. No prior case has taken such a restricted view of the relevant forum, and I think it can be readily demonstrated that the Court's premise is incorrect.

The Supreme Court has instructed that the relevant forum is to be determined by "the access sought by the speaker." *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 788, 801 (1985). The meaning of that instruction is made clear by the facts of *Cornelius*. The plaintiff sought access to what the Court called "a particular means of communication," *id.*—the Combined Federal Campaign, a charity drive aimed at federal employees. The Court ruled that the charity campaign itself was the relevant forum, rather than the entirety of the federal workplace. The cases relied on by *Cornelius* further illuminate the Court's meaning. In *Perry Education Assn. v. Perry Local Educators' Assn.*, 460 U.S. 37 (1983), the Court confined its inquiry to a school district's interschool mail system, rather than all parts of school property. *Cornelius* referred to the mail system as "a particular *means* of communication." 473 U.S. at 801 (emphasis added). In *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298 (1974), the Court confined its inquiry to advertising space on city-owned buses.

All of these cases focus on a means of communication, not the particular location where an advertiser prefers to display its ad. It is unimaginable that in *Cornelius* the Court would have permitted one political party to solicit funds through the Combined Federal Campaign at one side of the lobby of a federal building while denying another party the opportunity to solicit funds through the Campaign at the other side, or that in *Perry* the Court would have permitted one group to place a political message in the mail boxes of one school while denying another group a similar right at other schools, or that in *Lehman* the Court would have permitted political ads on one bus while prohibiting political ads on other buses.

The two cases relied on by the majority in the pending appeal, both interestingly and accurately cited with a signal meaning "compare," are also instructive. In *Air Line Pilots Assn. v. Dept. of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144 (7th Cir. 1995), the Court focused on diorama display cases throughout an airport, rather than the entirety of the airport. The Court did not limit its analysis to one display case. In *Hubbard Broadcasting, Inc. v. Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission*, 797 F.2d 552 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 986 (1986), the Court focused on all advertising space in a sports arena, rather than the entirety of the arena. The Court did not limit its analysis to one portion of the advertising space.

Nevertheless, the Court in the pending case limits its public forum analysis to the one billboard in Penn Station on which Lebron wishes to display his ad—the so-called "Spectacular." There is no question that this billboard is bigger than any other in Penn Station, more visible, and, if one can afford it, more desirable. But public forum analysis cannot be so particularized as to focus on one of several billboards on government property, no matter how preferable that one billboard's size and location may be to an advertiser. The reason can be readily demonstrated. As everyone who has ever walked through Penn Station knows, the Spectacular is high atop the west wall of the station's rotunda, and two small billboards are

high atop the north and south walls of the same rotunda. If Amtrak had permitted the Democratic Party to place political ads on either of the two smaller billboards in the rotunda, can it be seriously argued that any court would limit its forum analysis to the one large billboard and permit Amtrak to deny the Republican Party the opportunity to place its political ad on the Spectacular, just because no political ad had previously been on that precise space?

The relevant forum must be at least advertising space in the rotunda of Penn Station—the means of communication to which Lebron sought access. Once the forum is defined to have at least this scope, Amtrak's violation of the First Amendment is evident because it has leased advertising space on a kiosk in the rotunda for *The Plain Truth*, a magazine the Court acknowledges is devoted to "political and social issues." It is clearly unconstitutional for Amtrak to permit its advertising space in the rotunda to be used to convey the message of *The Plain Truth* and deny space in the same rotunda to the message that Lebron believes conveys the plain truth about the brewers of Coors Beer.

2. *Amtrak's policy.* Even if the relevant forum is the one billboard space known as The Spectacular, the Court's second premise—that the scope and lawfulness of Amtrak's exercise of discretion regarding political ads may be ascertained solely from its past practice—is also unsound. The proper inquiry, the Supreme Court has instructed, focuses not solely on past practice but on "policy and practice," *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 802; *see Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 303 ("policies and practices"). If it were the case that the only evidence of Amtrak's approach to political ads was its past practice, an inquiry confined to that practice would be defensible. But the record in this case contains more evidence, and the District Court made findings based on that evidence that are not even arguably clearly erroneous.

First, the agreement between Amtrak and Transportation Displays Incorporated (TDI), the leasing agent for billboards

in Penn Station, states, "All advertising material, exhibit material, notices and advertisements, and their manner of presentation and design, shall be subject to approval by Amtrak, which may disapprove any such items at its own discretion." *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 811 F. Supp. 993, 1002 (S.D.N.Y. 1993). It is difficult to imagine a more standardless statement of policy. Second, as the District Court found, neither the key Amtrak official responsible for supervising Amtrak's arrangements with TDI nor any of the executives of TDI knew of any prohibition on political advertising at any of Amtrak's facilities. *Id.* Third, other key Amtrak officials could not agree on what Amtrak's policy was. One testified that the policy prohibited only those advertisements that were both "political and divisive or objectionable," while another could not say what the policy meant. *Id.* Fourth, the guidelines of Amtrak's leasing agent, TDI, do not prohibit political advertisements but merely consider them commercial and therefore subject to full rate charge. *Id.* at 1003.

In view of this evidence, the District Court's findings that Amtrak's alleged policy against political ads was unwritten, unclear, and undisseminated provide ample basis for the Court's ultimate conclusion that the policy permitted the unfettered exercise of discretion and created the risk of abuse that the First Amendment prohibits. *See Lebron v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority*, 749 F.2d 893, 899 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

Disregarding the evidence and the District Judge's findings, this Court ascertains Amtrak's policy solely by looking to the past practice of not yet contracting for a political ad on the Spectacular. But where a policy is unwritten, unclear, and undisseminated, the fact that it has not yet been used discriminatorily does not save it from invalidation under the First Amendment. The vice of conferring unfettered discretion on government officials to determine which messages may be conveyed is not avoided by their past pattern of not making a discriminatory decision. The vice inheres in the opportunity for

discrimination, and the First Amendment requires that opportunity to be held to an acceptable minimum by a clear and well understood policy that appropriately limits the discretion of the officials who must administer it. *See Gentile v. State Bar of Nevada*, 111 S. Ct. 2720, 2732 (1991) (imprecise standards concerning permissible statements by lawyers); *Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.*, 486 U.S. 750, 755-59 (1988) (unfettered discretion to permit newspaper dispensing devices on governmental property). As the Supreme Court has observed,

> The prohibition against vague regulations of speech is based in part on the need to eliminate the impermissible risk of discriminatory enforcement. . . . The question is not whether discriminatory enforcement occurred here, and we assume it did not, but whether the Rule is so imprecise that discriminatory enforcement is a real possibility."

Gentile, 111 S. Ct. at 2732 (citations omitted). In some cases, it might be possible to infer the existence of a policy that passes constitutional muster from a record consisting solely of a pattern of past practice. But in the pending case such a policy cannot be inferred from past practice in the face of substantial evidence that has persuaded a District Judge to make findings that the alleged policy was not understood by the officials responsible for administering it.

Wholly apart from the absence of a clear, understandable, and understood policy, Lebron might be correct that, to the extent that the defendant's policy purports to bar political ads, it is a viewpoint-based discrimination that violates the First Amendment. *See Air Line Pilots Assn. v. Department of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144 (7th Cir. 1995). As Lebron contends, the defendants are willing to display an ad urging the public to buy Coor's beer but are unwilling to display his ad urging the public not to do so. He makes a substantial argument that viewpoint-based discrimination is occurring when government allows an ad promoting the sale of a product, but purports to

prohibit an ad opposing a product because of the views of its manufacturer. Presumably, Amtrak would allow an ad opposing the sale of Coor's beer because of its alcoholic content or for any reason unrelated to the views of its manufacturer. I need not decide whether to accept Lebron's argument since his other positions are well supported on this record.

In my view, the District Court's findings, fully supported by the evidence, entitled Lebron to prevail on his claim that Amtrak's refusal to permit display of his ad violated the First Amendment. At a minimum, he is entitled to a declaration that Amtrak has violated the First Amendment, damages (to the extent, if any, not precluded by *F.D.I.C. v. Meyer*, 114 S. Ct. 996, 1004-06 (1994)), and equitable relief requiring promulgation and dissemination of a clear policy concerning political ads. Since the Court concludes that Amtrak has no liability at all, I need not consider the further issue of whether the equitable relief ought to include a requirement that Lebron's ad be displayed. My statement from the prior appeal, 12 F.3d at 394 (Newman, C.J., dissenting), quoted by the Court out of its context, was directed solely at the issue of the possible scope of relief, not the issue of liability on which the Court today rules.

I respectfully dissent.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

No. 1494—August Term, 1992

(Argued: April 27, 1993 Decided: December 27, 1993

Reversed and Remanded: February 21, 1995

Reargued: May 11, 1995 Decided: October 30, 1995

On rehearing: December 29, 1995)

Docket No. 93-7127

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellee,

—vs.—

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Defendant-Appellant,

—and—

TRANSPORTATION DISPLAYS, INCORPORATED,

Defendant-Counter-Claimant.

Before:

NEWMAN, *Chief Judge*, and
LUMBARD and MAHONEY, *Circuit Judges*.

Opinion on rehearing of this Court's October 30, 1995 reversal of the judgment of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Pierre N. Leval, *Judge*, that granted an injunction to plaintiff-counter-defendant-appellee Michael A. Lebron requiring defendant-appellant National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) and defendant-counter-claimant Transportation Displays, Incorporated to display a political advertisement prepared by Lebron on a large billboard known as the Spectacular in New York City's Pennsylvania Station. The petition for rehearing is denied. Chief Judge Newman dissents in a separate opinion.

GLORIA C. PHARES, New York, New York, (Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker, New York, New York, R. Bruce Rich, Bernadette McCann Ezring, Jonathan Bloom, Marc Brotman, Weil, Gotshal & Manges, New York, New York, David D. Cole, Center for Constitutional Rights, Washington, D.C., of counsel), *for Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellee*.

KEVIN T. BAINE, Washington, D.C. (Nicole K. Seligman, Steven M. Farina, Williams & Connolly, Washington, D.C., William G. Ballaine, Mark S. Landman, Siff Rosen P.C., New York, New York, of counsel), *for Defendant-Appellant*.

MAHONEY, *Circuit Judge*:

Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellee Michael A. Lebron petitions for rehearing of this Court's decision in *Lebron v.*

National Railroad Passenger Corp. (Amtrak), No. 93-1727, [App., *supra*, 1a] (2d Cir. Oct. 30, 1995) ("*Lebron I*"), familiarity with which is assumed. We deny the petition for rehearing, but amend *Lebron I* as follows:

1. The sentence at [App., *supra*, 15a, lines 14-17], is deleted.

2. The sentence at [App., *supra*, 16a, lines 3-9], is amended to read as follows:

> Because Lebron insisted that TDI display his proposed advertisement only on the Spectacular, his attempt to attack Amtrak's policies regarding the acceptance of advertisements in Penn Station generally, rather than on the Spectacular, amounts, in substance, to a facial challenge to those policies as they might be applied to advertisements other than Lebron's and to locations not at issue.

3. The two sentences at [App., *supra*, 18a, lines 19-22], are replaced by the following:

> We reverse the judgment of the district court and remand for consideration of Lebron's contract claim and TDI's counterclaim for a declaratory judgment that it is entitled to terminate the Lease. Because initial subject matter jurisdiction over Lebron's federal claim is now clear, and a full trial has been "conducted on an expedited basis, upon written submissions," *Lebron I*, 811 F. Supp. at 994, the interests of judicial economy and fairness to the parties counsel that this litigation be completed in federal court.

We note the assertion in Chief Judge Newman's dissent from this disposition of the petition for rehearing that we now approve an inconsistent Amtrak policy because, "as the District Court found, advertisements falling within a broad category of political messages had been displayed in Penn Station." Judge Leval concluded only that a handful of the

advertisements shown in Penn Station over the years had been "arguably 'political.' " *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp. (Amtrak)*, 811 F. Supp. 993, 1004 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (referring to advertisements by New York Department of the Environment, New York Department of Commerce, a foundation for muscular dystrophy, and *Plain Truth* magazine; and public service advertisements concerning "subjects such as the homeless, the environment, drunk driving, AIDS awareness, health issues, and race relations"). Amtrak is probably entitled to consider such advertisements as "public service announcements" within the meaning of its standard licensing agreement. *See Lebron I*, [App., *supra*, 6a-7a]. In any event, "Amtrak's billboard space in Pennsylvania Station, even if used in the past for ads of a public service nature, has not become a forum for ads of such pointed political content as Lebron's attack on the makers of Coors beer for promoting 'the Far Right's political agenda.' " *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 12 F.3d 388, 394 (2d Cir 1993) (Newman, C.J., dissenting), *rev'd and remanded*, 115 S. Ct. 961 (1995).

We rely upon *Lebron I* with respect to our analysis of the forum issue. *See id.*, [App., *supra*, 8a-14a].

JON O. NEWMAN, *Chief Judge*, dissenting:

I respectfully dissent from the denial of the petition for rehearing.

When the Court first issued its opinion on the merits of Lebron's First Amendment challenge, it premised substantial portions of its ruling on the view that Amtrak's advertising policy on political messages, whatever the policy's content, was limited in geographic scope to the one large billboard in Penn Station known as "the Spectacular." Lebron's petition for rehearing challenges that premise, pointing out unrefuted contrary evidence in the record, a contrary assumption, if not

a finding, underlying the District Court's analysis, and the acknowledgement by Amtrak in its appellate brief that its policy "applies to all advertising in Amtrak's facilities." Brief for Appellant at 7. The Court responds to Lebron's petition by amending its opinion to delete the two passages of the opinion as originally issued that had asserted that Amtrak's policy against political advertisements is limited to the Spectacular.

Though the deletions are fully justified, they leave the Court's legal analysis of Lebron's First Amendment challenge even more vulnerable than I thought it was at the time of the original opinion. *See* ___ F.3d ___, ___ (Newman, C.J., dissenting). For example, the original opinion had concluded that there is no evidence that Amtrak's policy has ever been applied inconsistently "because the policy against political advertising was limited in scope to the Spectacular." Id. at ___. The revised recognition that Amtrak's policy, whatever its content, is not limited in scope to the Spectacular leaves unsupported the majority's view that the policy has not been applied inconsistently. In fact, as the District Court found, advertisements falling within a broad category of political messages had been displayed in Penn Station.[1] The majority has concluded that the policy has been consistently applied by overlooking the instances where it has not been consistently applied. This conclusion, previously reached on

---

[1] The majority again notes, as it did in the initial opinion on the merits, that my dissent from the very first *Lebron* ruling had observed that Penn Station "has not become a forum for ads *of such pointed political content* as Lebron's [proposed ad for the Spectacular.]" 12 F.3d at 394 (emphasis added). The fact that the ads Amtrak previously allowed in Penn Station were only of a general political nature and did not contain political content as "pointed" as Lebron's ad does not detract in any way from the District Court's finding, supported by abundant evidence, that the Amtrak policy has been inconsistently applied. Whether the difference between Lebron's ad and prior ads should have a bearing on the scope of relief, which is the issue I discussed in the prior dissent, is an issue entirely different from whether Amtrak has incurred liability for applying its "policy" inconsistently in violation of the First Amendment.

a view that the policy applied only to one location, is left in place, even though there is now recognition that the policy applies throughout Amtrak's facilities.

Perhaps the majority now means to rest its ultimate conclusion solely on its view that the relevant forum for purposes of public forum analysis is only the Spectacular. I previously set forth my reasons for thinking that that view is not legally sound. *See id.* at ___-___. With the factual underpinning of the majority's view as to the scope of the Amtrak policy now discarded, I simply note that the public forum view of the majority, even if correct, is irrelevant since, no matter what the scope of the forum, a governmental entity violates the First Amendment when it bars display of political messages pursuant to a "policy" that has been found by a fact-finder, with abundant evidentiary support, to be vague, unwritten, undisseminated, unclear to those who must administer it, and inconsistently applied. In *Board of Airport Commissioners v. Jews for Jesus, Inc.*, 482 U.S. 569 (1987), the Supreme Court found it unnecessary to decide whether the Los Angeles International Airport was a public forum because the governmental ordinance regulating speech on the premises was constitutionally defective. *Id.* at 573-74. The constitutional defects in Amtrak's "policy" similarly make public forum analysis irrelevant.

I agree with the majority that the state law issues are properly returned to the District Court for further consideration, but I would grant the petition for rehearing.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

92 Civ. 9411 (PNL)

Dated: February 5, 1993

As Amended February 8, 1993

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Plaintiff,

—v.—

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK) and TRANSPORTATION DISPLAYS INCORPORATED,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law

PIERRE N. LEVAL, U.S.D.J.

This is a so-called "Bivens" action,[1] brought under the First Amendment by an artist, Michael A. Lebron, would-be lessor of a gigantic billboard in New York's Pennsylvania Station. The primary defendant is Amtrak, the National Passenger Railroad Corporation, which, as owner of the billboard, rejected the two-month lease plaintiff had contracted for with Amtrak's leasing agent because plaintiff's display was "polit-

---

[1] *See Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

ical." Plaintiff contends the rejection was inconsistent with the requirements of the First Amendment. He sues to invalidate the rejection so that he can obtain the benefit of his lease agreement.

As an alternative theory, plaintiff alleges that Amtrak and its leasing agent Transportation Displays Incorporated ("TDI"), the second defendant, are estopped by reason of delay from denying plaintiff's contract.

On the consent of the parties, trial was conducted on an expedited basis, upon written submissions. The court's findings of fact and conclusions of law are as follows.

Background

Lebron is an artist who creates works for display on billboards. His works often involve commentary on public issues. *See, e.g., Lebron v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority*, 749 F.2d 893 (D.C. Cir. 1984). During 1991 and 1992, he made plans for a photomontage for a particular billboard in Penn Station. The billboard is known as the Spectacular; it is a curved, back-lit display space approximately 103 feet wide and 10 feet high, covering the east-facing wall of the rotunda area, facing passengers (and others) who walk westward toward the waiting areas, ticket booths, and train platforms.

Defendant TDI is an advertising agency that handles the leasing of billboards for many of Amtrak's properties and for other billboard owners in the rail transportation system. Amtrak has authorized TDI to lease the billboards in Penn Station. While the licensing agreement reserves for Amtrak the right of approval of all advertising copy, in practice, Amtrak does not review advertising copy, excepting advertisements for the Spectacular.

In August 1991, Lebron first contacted TDI about contracting for billboard space in Penn Station. He spoke from time to time with William B. Schwartz, a TDI account executive. Schwartz told him that while no displays would be

accepted that included obscenity or violence, there were no other policy restrictions on advertising.

The Spectacular was available for two months at the beginning of 1993. Lebron and TDI reached agreement on financial terms of $18,500 a month for January and February 1993. In August 1992, Schwartz gave Lebron the standard rental form contract, which Lebron signed and returned. During the negotiations, Schwartz asked Lebron what he would display on the billboard. Lebron responded that in general his work was political, although it often looked like advertising, but that he preferred to keep confidential the specific content of the work he was creating for the Spectacular. Schwartz did not suggest that the political nature of the work would be a problem.

On November 30, 1992, TDI signed the agreement. The terms of the contract included the following:

> All advertising copy is subject to approval of TDI and the Transportation Facility concerned [*i.e.*, the owner of the billboard] as to character, text, illustration, design and operation.
>
> If for any cause beyond its control TDI shall cease to have the right to continue the advertising covered by this contract, or if the Transportation Facility concerned should deem such advertising objectionable for any reason, TDI shall have the right to terminate the contract and discontinue the service without notice.

During the fall, Lebron worked on creation of his piece for the 10 × 103 foot space. On December 2, 1992, he provided TDI with a color photocopy of his piece. The work is a photomontage, accompanied by considerable text. Taking off on a widely circulated Coors beer advertisement which proclaims Coors to be the "Right Beer," Lebron's piece is captioned "Is it the Right's Beer Now?" It includes photographic images of convivial drinkers of Coors beer, juxtaposed with a Nicaraguan village scene in which peasants are menaced by a can of Coors that hurtles towards them, leaving behind a tail of

fire, as if it were a missile. The accompanying text, appearing on either end of the montage, criticizes the Coors family for its support of right-wing causes, particularly the contras in Nicaragua. Again taking off on Coors' advertising which uses the slogan of "Silver Bullet" for its beer cans, the text proclaims that Coors is "The Silver Bullet that aims The Far Right's political agenda at the heart of America."

On December 7, TDI sent the work on to Amtrak for approval. Ten days later, Anthony DeAngelo, the Amtrak Vice President for Real Estate and Operations Development, the person authorized by Amtrak's Board of Directors to oversee third-party advertising located on Amtrak property, disapproved Lebron's work on the grounds that it was "political." Amtrak notified TDI of this decision on December 23 in a letter stating that "Amtrak's policy is that it will not allow political advertising on the [S]pectacular advertising sign." Lebron learned of Amtrak's rejection from TDI on December 29, 1992, three days before his advertisement was to appear in the Spectacular.

Discussion

A. *Governmental Action*

Lebron contends that in rejecting his work Amtrak engaged in censorship in violation of his free speech rights under the First Amendment. Alternatively put, he contends that Amtrak's actions violated the requirements that the First Amendment imposes on governmental regulation of speech. The prohibitions of the First Amendment are "a restraint on government action, not that of private persons." *Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. v. Democratic National Committee*, 412 U.S. 94, 114 (1973) (citing *Public Utilities Comm'n v. Pollak*, 343 U.S. 451 (1952)).

Amtrak claims it is a private entity, immune from the restrictions of the First Amendment and, to the contrary, guaranteed the right under the First Amendment to control speech on its billboards in whatever fashion it chooses. The first

issue in contention thus turns on whether Amtrak should be deemed a governmental or a private actor for these purposes.

"Conduct that is formally 'private' may become . . . so impregnated with a governmental character as to become subject to the constitutional limitations placed upon state action." *Evans v. Newton*, 382 U.S. 296, 299 (1966). The Supreme Court has outlined several ways through which the activities of a private entity can become governmental action. One such standard is relevant here.[2] Under this standard, known as the "symbiotic relationship" test, private activity becomes subject to the restrictions that the Constitution imposes on government when the government "has so far insinuated itself into a position of interdependence with [the private entity] that it must be recognized as a joint participant in the challenged activity." *Burton v. Wilmington Parking Auth.*, 365 U.S. 715, 725 (1961); *accord Evans v. Newton*, 382 U.S. at 299. There must be a " 'sufficiently close nexus between the State and the challenged action . . . so that the action of the [private actor] may be fairly treated as that of the State itself.' " *Blum v. Yaretsky*, 457 U.S. 991, 1004 (1982) (quoting *Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, 419 U.S. 345, 351 (1974)). *See also Myron v. Consolidated Rail Corp.*, 752 F.2d 50, 54 (2d Cir. 1985) (same standards applied in assessing "federal action"

---

[2] The other two standards are the "public function" doctrine, *Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 157 (1978), and the "state compulsion" doctrine, *Adickes v. S. H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144 (1970). The latter is applicable when the government "has exercised coercive power or has provided . . . significant encouragement, either overt or covert," to bring about the challenged action. *Blum v. Yaretsky*, 457 U.S. 991, 1004 (1982). The former doctrine holds government action may be present "if the private entity has exercised powers that are 'traditionally the exclusive prerogative of the State.'" *Blum*, 457 U.S. at 1005 (quoting *Jackson v. Metropolitan Edison Co.*, 419 U.S. 345, 353 (1974)); *see also Flagg Bros., Inc. v. Brooks*, 436 U.S. 149, 160 (1978). It is not enough that the government has authorized a private entity to perform a task; it must be a role traditionally performed by the state. *See Flagg Bros.*, 436 U.S. at 160-62; *Jackson*, 419 U.S. at 352-53; *see also Marsh v. Alabama*, 326 U.S. 501 (1946) (company town with all the attributes of public town subject to constitutional limitations).

as for "state action") (citing cases). The symbiotic relationship test "focuses on the [government's] overall relationship with the private actor," *Hadges v. Yonkers Racing Corp.*, 918 F.2d 1079, 1082 (2d Cir. 1990), and "does not require that the plaintiff demonstrate that the state was involved in the challenged conduct." *Stevens v. New York Racing Ass'n, Inc.*, 665 F. Supp. 164, 171 (E.D.N.Y. 1987).

The Supreme Court has consistently emphasized that the issue of state, or governmental, action turns on a factual inquiry specific to each situation. "Only by sifting facts and weighing circumstances can the nonobvious involvement of the State in private conduct be attributed its true significance." *Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority*, 365 U.S. at 722 (private restaurant, operated in space leased from city owned parking garage, that refused service to blacks, deemed governmental actor where revenues from discriminatory service ultimately financed the public parking facility); *see Skinner v. Railway Labor Executives Ass'n*, 489 U.S. 602, 614 (1989) ("Whether a private party should be deemed an agent or instrument of the Government for Fourth Amendment purposes necessarily turns on the degree of the Government's participation in the private party's activities, a question that can only be resolved 'in light of all the circumstances.' ") (citations omitted); *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922, 939 (1982) (determination "necessarily fact-bound"); *see also Rendell-Baker v. Kohn*, 457 U.S. 830, 838 (1982) (private remedial school held to be non-governmental, notwithstanding state regulation and funding, in a suit by discharged teachers).

I conclude, based on examination of the federal government's deep and controlling entwinement in Amtrak's structure and operations, that, when Amtrak undertakes to control the content of speech on its billboards, its conduct must be deemed governmental rather than private.

What is clear at a glance is that Amtrak does not comfortably fit the conventional mold of either private or governmental entity.

In form and name it resembles more closely a private entity. It is a for-profit business corporation and is decreed by act of Congress "not [to] be an agency, instrumentality, authority, or entity, or establishment of the United States Government." 45 U.S.C. § 541. Its common stock is owned by private railroad companies.

On the other hand, in both image and reality, it is impregnated with governmental character and inseparably intertwined with governmental authority and financing. Looking first at the symbolic, Congress established Amtrak, 45 U.S.C. § 501, and defined it as a "mixed-ownership government corporation." 31 U.S.C. § 9101. It is defined in the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, *et seq.*, as a "public entity."[3] 42 U.S.C. § 12131(1)(C).

More significant is the governmental penetration of Amtrak's operations. All of Amtrak's directors are appointed directly or indirectly by the President of the United States. 45 U.S.C. § 543. Of its nine board members, five are directly appointed by the President;[4] the sixth is the Secretary of Transportation sitting ex officio, who is also appointed directly by the President. Two board members are selected by the United States Government, as the owner of all of Amtrak's preferred stock. The final member of the board is the president of Amtrak, who is selected by the other directors. The parties agree that Amtrak's board is responsible for controlling Amtrak and would have the authority to approve or disapprove of Amtrak's advertising policies throughout its facilities. Indeed, the board has, by resolution, authorized Amtrak's current agreements with TDI concerning advertising.

---

[3] Amtrak is also subject to the Freedom of Information Act. 45 U.S.C. § 546(g).

[4] One is selected from a list supplied by the Railway Labor Executives Association, one from among the governors of states with an interest in rail transportation, and one as a representative of business with an interest in rail transportation. 45 U.S.C. § 543(a)(1)(C). Two directors are selected from lists of names supplied by commuter authorities that work with Amtrak. § 543(a)(1)(D)(ii).

The federal government is also deeply involved in the financing of Amtrak's operations. Every year, Congress appropriates the sum necessary to cover the shortfall of Amtrak's operating results. *See* 45 U.S.C. § 601.[5] For example, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, Congress has appropriated up to $846 million for Amtrak's operating losses, capital improvements, tax liability, and labor protection costs and for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program. Pub. L. 102-388, 106 Stat. 1520 (Oct. 6, 1992). For this reason, Amtrak's revenues from the leasing of its billboard space are, in a sense, revenue of the federal government. Every dollar of net billboard revenue realized by Amtrak results in a one dollar reduction of the subsidy obligation of the federal government. Conversely, if Amtrak subsidized any exhibitor on its billboards by charging less than the market rate, the display would essentially be financed by the federal government.[6]

Amtrak has also been vested with various attributes of governmental character. For example, Congress has given Amtrak the power of eminent domain, 45 U.S.C. § 545(d), exemption

---

[5] In fact, as the parties have agreed, in 1976, Amtrak's fiscal year end for accounting purposes was changed from December 31 to September 30 "to coincide with the fiscal year adopted by the federal government and used in providing federal assistance to [Amtrak]."

Congress stated as a goal that Amtrak use its "best business judgment in taking actions to minimize Federal subsidies." 45 U.S.C. § 501a(1), and Congress encouraged Amtrak to "enter into agreements with the private sector and undertake initiatives which are consistent with good business judgment and designed to maximize its revenues and minimize Federal subsidies." 45 U.S.C. § 501a(14).

[6] *See Burton*, 365 U.S. at 724 (discriminatory practices of restaurant allegedly increased business and therefore benefitted the restaurant's landlord, the government, supporting finding of state action); *Citizens to End Animal Suffering & Exploitation, Inc. v. Faneuil Hall Marketplace, Inc.*, 745 F. Supp. 65, 73 (D. Mass. 1990) (state action finding supported by fact that success of private entity served financial interests of city in reviving urban area); *Stevens v. New York Racing Ass'n. Inc.*, 665 F. Supp. at 172-75 (likelihood of state action where excess revenues of the non-profit association went to the state).

from state and local taxes and fees, including all real estate taxes, 45 U.S.C. § 546(b), and various loan guarantees, 45 U.S.C. § 602, so that it borrows under the credit of the federal government. Amtrak is required to report annually to Congress on its operations. 45 U.S.C. § 548.

Finally, the federal government has invested billions of dollars in Amtrak's properties. Amtrak acquired its Northeast Corridor properties, including Penn Station, by statutory condemnation paid for by the United States.[7] *See* Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, 45 U.S.C. § 701 *et seq*. The federal government has also invested billions of dollars in the improvement of Amtrak's Northeast Corridor facilities. *See* 45 U.S.C. § 854 (authorizing up to $2.5 billion). While Amtrak owns the fee in Penn Station, the federal government holds a mortgage on it, and indeed on all the Northeast Corridor properties.[8]

---

[7] After much litigation and negotiation, the federal government, in 1981, paid Penn Central $2.113 billion as compensation for the Northeast Corridor properties, including Penn Station.

[8] In addition, portions of Penn Station are used by other governmental entities under leases with Amtrak. For example, Amtrak leases significant portions of Penn Station to the Long Island Rail Road (LIRR) and New Jersey Transit (NJT), both public entities, for the operation of their respective rail passenger services. An array of leases and joint agreements among Amtrak, LIRR, and NJT govern the management of public areas of Penn Station and the funding of construction and maintenance of various train and tunnel facilities. Hence, portions of the station occupied by LIRR and NJT are subject to constitutional limitations, and these areas are largely contiguous with those controlled by Amtrak. Indeed, some facilities of LIRR and NJT, such as ticket and information booths, are in the midst of Amtrak's facilities on the same floor of Penn Station as the Spectacular. Notably, the public therefore has little way of knowing whether or not it is in an area where constitutional limitations apply. *See Coleman v. Wagner College*, 429 F.2d 1120, 1127 (2d Cir. 1970) (Friendly, J., concurring) (suggesting that one rationale for holding of *Burton* is that when "citizens may reasonably believe [action] to have been taken at the state's instance, state action may legitimately be found even though the state left the private actors almost complete freedom of choice").

Thus, when Amtrak undertakes to control the content of the messages on its billboards in Penn Station, these controls are exercised by a corporation whose directors are appointed by the President, whose operations are financed by the federal government, and whose properties, in major part, are mortgaged to the federal government.

Amtrak contends that it cannot be deemed a governmental actor. It first cites a range of cases which found in various contexts that Amtrak is not a government agency or entity. *See, e.g., National R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Atchison, T. & S.F. Ry. Co.*, 470 U.S. 451, 454 (1985); *National R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Two Parcels of Land*, 822 F.2d 1261, 1264 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 954 (1987); *Ehm v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 732 F.2d 1250, 1253-56 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 982 (1984); *Kimbrough v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 549 F. Supp. 169, 173 (M.D. Ala. 1982); *Sentner v. Amtrak*, 540 F. Supp. 557 (D.N.J. 1982). These cases do not determine the question in this case. Plaintiff does not contend that Amtrak is a governmental agency. What plaintiff contends is that the federal government is sufficiently entwined in Amtrak's operations and authority that the particular actions at issue must be deemed governmental action.

Next Amtrak relies on a number of cases in which discharged employees charged either Amtrak or the similarly structured Consolidated Rail Corporation ("Conrail") with unconstitutional governmental action. In each of these cases, the courts held that Amtrak's (or Conrail's) actions in dealing with its employees were not deemed to be governmental action. *See, e.g., Myron v. Consolidated Rail Corp.*, 752 F.2d 50 (2d Cir. 1985) (constitutional limitations do not apply to the activities of Conrail in discharging an individual employee); *Anderson v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 754 F.2d 202, 204 (7th Cir. 1984) (in challenge to employee termination, Amtrak not a state actor); *Andrews v. Consolidated Rail Corp.*, 831 F.2d 678 (7th Cir. 1987) (Conrail not state actor in refusing to reinstate employee); *Morin v. Consolidated Rail Corp.*, 810 F.2d 720 (7th Cir. 1987) (no state

action in discharging employee); *Marcucci v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 589 F. Supp. 725 (N.D. Ill. 1984) (no state action in wrongful discharge suit); *Rost v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 1989 WL 104809 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 11, 1989) ("no allegations concerning the nexus between the federal government and Amtrak's personnel practices."); *Hankin v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10741 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 16, 1987) (following *Anderson*); *cf. Railway Labor Executives Ass'n v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 691 F. Supp. 1516, 1524 n.11 (D.D.C. 1988) (drug testing by Amtrak not Fourth Amendment violation). Amtrak argues that these authorities conclusively determine for the present litigation that it is not a governmental actor.

The argument is unpersuasive. The fact that Amtrak is considered a private employer in administering its employment of personnel does not mean it will be deemed private when it regulates speech. Whether conduct of a particular entity will be deemed governmental action can vary with the type of action at issue.[9] As Judge Friendly explained in *Wahba v. New York University*, 492 F.2d 96, 100 (2d Cir. 1974), "we do not find decisions dealing with one form of state involvement and a particular provision of the Bill of Rights at all determinative in passing upon claims concerning different forms of government involvement and other constitutional guarantees." *See also Weise v. Syracuse University*, 522 F.2d 397, 404 (2d Cir. 1975). Indeed Amtrak conceded at oral argument that, if it restricted service to passengers on the basis of race, religion, or national origin, it would be deemed a governmental actor in that respect. *See Burton v. Wilmington Parking Authority, supra.*

In my view, the regulation of public speech through the use of the billboards in public train stations raises very different

---

[9] Indeed, several courts have concluded that Amtrak can be a state actor in the context of false arrest claims brought against Amtrak security officers. *See, e.g., Merola v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 683 F. Supp. 935, 940-41 (S.D.N.Y. 1988); *Sisak v. National Railroad Passenger Corp.*, 1992 WL 42245 (S.D.N.Y. February 24, 1992).

considerations from Amtrak's administration of its work force.

In actions based on an employer's dealings with employees, no particularly great significance attaches to whether the employer's actions are deemed to be private or governmental. There are no important policies of the Constitution that would be undermined by permitting an employer that is entwined with government to deal with employees under the rules that govern private employers. On the other hand, where the conduct in question is the regulation of speech, enormous differences follow from whether the actor is deemed to act as government or as a private individual. And to allow an entity controlled by and intertwined with the government to regulate, control, or censor speech in the manner that is permitted for a private actor risks to do enormous damage to one of the most important principles of the Bill of Rights.

If Amtrak is deemed a private actor for this purpose, it would enjoy the full range of the private citizen's rights of free speech under the First Amendment. It would be free to exercise discriminatory control over the messages transmitted by its billboards. For example, as the Presidential election approached, Amtrak would have the absolute right to devote all of its billboards to champion the reelection of the incumbent president and warn of danger to the republic if the challenger should be elected. Amtrak would enjoy this right, just like the owner of a private bar or bowling alley who has the undeniable right to cover the walls, if he chooses, with posters advocating the reelection of the president. Similarly, Amtrak would be free to sponsor advertisements on its billboards either opposing abortion or favoring choice; it could likewise advocate adherence to Catholicism and deprecate Protestantism, or vice versa, as it chose.

If, on the other hand, Amtrak's billboard regulation is deemed governmental, Amtrak would be barred from favoring a political candidate, from favoring messages of any chosen viewpoint, from sponsoring messages that established religion, from exercising arbitrary discrimination in allowing access to its billboards, and from regulating the speech of its

billboard tenants in any way, except within narrow parameters.

Among the most powerful principles asserted by our Constitution are those found in the First Amendment designed to prevent Government from exercising discretionary control over the content of the speech of private persons and entities. "Regulations which permit the Government to discriminate on the basis of the content of the message cannot be tolerated under the First Amendment," *Regan v. Time, Inc.*, 468 U.S. 641, 648-49 (1984) (citations omitted), for "the Government's ability to impose content-based burdens on speech raises the spector that the Government may effectively drive certain ideas or viewpoints from the marketplace." *Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of New York State Crime Victims Bd.*, 112 S.Ct. 501, 508 (1991) (citation omitted).

Given the force of this principle, it is inconceivable that Amtrak, whose directors are appointed by the President, whose operations are financed by the Government, and which is subject to Governmental control and intertwinement in all the respects outlined above, would be free under the First Amendment to donate its billboards to the support of the incumbent President's reelection campaign. But that is the inevitable consequence if Amtrak is correct in its contention that it is engaged in private action when it controls the content of ads on its billboards.

One might argue that the conclusion should be otherwise when control is exercised not by the Presidentially-appointed directors, but by a lower level employee. But the argument is not persuasive. Regardless to what degree the board of directors exercises its control, it has the power to control the actions of the corporation it governs. Furthermore, the controls here at issue were exercised by a high officer, the director of Amtrak's real estate operations, to whom the Amtrak board had directly delegated such authority.[10]

---

[10] Indeed, the minutes of meetings of Amtrak's board of directors show that the board has, on at least one occasion, authorized an individual lease for the Spectacular.

I conclude that, notwithstanding Amtrak's private character in its employment contracts, it must be deemed to engage in governmental action when it undertakes to regulate the content of the advertisements on its billboards.

B. *The Requirements of the First Amendment*

I now turn to the question whether Amtrak's actions comport with the requirements that the First Amendment places on such governmental conduct.

Along with other constraints, the First Amendment requires that, when the government regulates speech, it must do so by a policy that is (i) clearly set forth, (ii) not so vague as to be subject to abuse, (iii) consistently applied and (iv) not based on viewpoint. These rules are intended to avoid the risk that government may impose arbitrary, discriminatory, or preferential controls on speech. *See generally City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.*, 486 U.S. 750, 757-764 (1988) (invalidating ordinance giving town mayor complete discretion in licensing sidewalk newsracks). Without explicit standards, clearly disclosed, government regulation of speech may be applied in an arbitrary and discriminatory manner. *See Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U.S. 104, 108-09 (1972); *Cramp v. Board of Public Instruction*, 368 U.S. 278, 286-87 (1961) (terms of regulation must be "susceptible of objective measurement"). The Supreme Court has cautioned that a scheme for regulating speech "that places 'unbridled discretion in the hands of a government official or agency constitutes a prior restraint and may result in censorship.' " *FW/PBS, Inc. v. City of Dallas*, 493 U.S. 215, 225 (1990) (quoting *Lakewood*, 486 U.S. at 757). "Precision of regulation must be the touchstone in an area so closely touching our most precious freedoms." *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 438 (1963). In addition, a government restriction may not discriminate against speech on the basis of the viewpoint of the speaker. *See Perry Educ. Ass'n v. Perry Local Educators' Ass'n*, 460 U.S. 37, 45-46 (1983) (regulation of public forum must be content-neutral; regulation of non-public forum must

be viewpoint-neutral); *see also United States v. Kokinda*, 497 U.S. 720, 729 (1990); *Longo v. United States Postal Service*, 953 F.2d 790, 796 (2d Cir.) ("[r]estrictions on expression because of disagreement with message or idea being conveyed by the speaker" violate First Amendment), *vacated and remanded on other grounds*, ___ U.S. ___, 113 S. Ct. 31 (1992), *reinstated*, 983 F.2d 91 (2d Cir. 1992); *see generally International Society for Krishna Consciousness v. Lee*, 1992, ___ U.S. ___, 112 S. Ct. 2701 (1992).

I find that Amtrak's policy violates the first three (and possibly also the fourth) of these requirements.

(i) *Not clearly set forth.* The Amtrak policy identified by Mr. DeAngelo as the reason for the rejection is its prohibition of "political" advertisements in Penn Station. Nowhere is this policy committed to writing. Nor was the existence of the policy disseminated. Thus TDI, which leased out nearly all the billboards in Penn Station without consulting Amtrak, was unaware of the policy's existence. An unwritten censorship policy is susceptible to inconsistent application that threatens free speech. *See Lakewood*, 486 U.S. at 757; *see also Abel v. Town of Orangetown*, 759 F. Supp. 161, 164-65 (S.D.N.Y. 1991) (invalidating zoning ordinance allowing town board unfettered discretion in granting consent to place sign on town property); *New Alliance Party v. Dinkins*, 743 F. Supp. 1055, 1064-65 (S.D.N.Y. 1990) (special events permitting system of parks violated First Amendment where permits granted or refused without any regulatory guidelines).

In attempting to identify a writing that contains its policy, Amtrak points to two earlier advertising licensing agreements between Amtrak (or its predecessor, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company) and TDI. These agreements, dated 1967 and 1980, governed TDI's leasing of the Spectacular. Both agreements contained a provision stating that Amtrak could refuse any advertising that Amtrak, "in its judgment," may deem "unlawful, immoral, improper or offensive to good taste . . . or involve political or other views which could result in dis-

sension or involve [Amtrak] in dissension, complaints or controversy with its patrons or the public . . . ."

However, neither of these licensing agreements is still in effect. The 1980 agreement, which superseded the 1967 agreement, was itself superseded by another agreement in 1985 covering all Amtrak billboards in Penn Station. The 1985 agreement and its successor, the 1991 agreement, do not include any provision comparable to the one in the 1967 and 1980 agreements. They do state that, "All advertising material, exhibit material, notices and advertisements, and their manner of presentation and design, shall be subject to approval by Amtrak, which may disapprove any such items at its own discretion." This broad provision clearly does not state, or even imply, the rejection of all "political" advertising.

Moreover, the evidence makes clear that Amtrak's supposed policy rejecting "political" advertising was not even known to many of those responsible for billboard advertising. William P. Delaney, a project manager in Amtrak's Real Estate Department who is responsible for supervising Amtrak's arrangements with TDI for advertising in Amtrak's facilities, knew of no prohibition on "political" advertising applicable to any of Amtrak's facilities. None of the executives at TDI, who had been leasing Penn Station billboard space for years and who had authority to approve advertising copy for all areas other than the Spectacular, knew of Amtrak's policy barring "political" advertisements.

(ii) *Vague*. Even if Amtrak's policy, as expressed by Mr. DeAngelo, were in writing, or otherwise clearly set forth, such a policy would still be constitutionally infirm, for the term "political" is of such unclear meaning that it is easily susceptible to arbitrary or discriminatory censorship by those administering the policy. *See Bullfrog Films, Inc. v. Wick*, 847 F.2d 502, 513-14 (9th Cir. 1988) (invalidating as vague regulations that barred issuing educational certificates to documentary films that attempted "to influence opinion, conviction or policy (religious, economic, or political propa-

ganda), to espouse a cause, or conversely, when they seem to attack a particular persuasion" and that "appear to have as their purpose or effect to attach or discredit economic, religious, or political views or practices"); *see also Coates v. Cincinnati*, 402 U.S. 611, 614 (1971) ("conduct . . . annoying to persons passing by" unconstitutionally vague); *Gay Men's Health Crisis v. Sullivan*, 792 F. Supp. 278, 293-96 (S.D.N.Y. 1992) ("offensive to a majority of adults" unconstitutionally vague).

The policy might be thought, for example, to bar only advertisements relative to candidates for political office. It might be thought to encompass public service messages on public issues, including drunk driving, safe sex, abortion counselling, and religious messages. It might also cover commercial advertising that included public service messages like "Keep America Beautiful," or that discussed controversial issues.

Amtrak's executives were themselves at odds over the meaning of Amtrak's policy. Mr. DeAngelo at times indicated that the policy prohibited only those advertisements that were both "political" *and* divisive or objectionable; at other times, he stated that the policy prohibited all advertisements that were not devoted to the selling of a product or service. Bruce M. Bourque, Amtrak's Project Director for Real Estate Development for Penn Station, who first reviews advertising material submitted for the Spectacular, knew that there was a policy barring "political" advertisements, but he could not really say what such a policy meant. *See U.S. Southwest Africa/Namibia Trade & Cultural Council v. United States*, 708 F.2d 760, 769 (D.C. Cir. 1983) ("the hazy line between ideological and commercial speech is reflected in the record of this case").

This is not to say that reasonable individuals could never agree that a particular advertisement was or was not "political." As the court explained in *U.S. Southwest Africa/ Namibia Trade & Cultural Council v. United States*, 708 F.2d at 769,

> The point is not that the distinction between commercial and political speech is entirely unworkable—there is little doubt that it can operate successfully at the extremes to screen out patently political from wholly commercial advertisements. Rather, the point is that there is a gray area near the middle in which this particular subject matter restriction tends to operate as a *sub rosa* penalty on presenting political viewpoints in "controversial," as opposed to more benign "commercial," forms.

This again reflects the manner in which Amtrak's policy is susceptible to abuse, for "[a]pplying this guideline involves an exercise of discretion and subjective judgment on the part of [Amtrak] officials." *Lebron v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority*, 749 F.2d 893, 899 (D.C. Cir. 1984). In such circumstances, the threat is great that "the policy operates in part to screen out only controversial, but not non-controversial, political messages." *U.S. Southwest Africa/ Namibia Trade & Cultural Council*, 708 F.2d at 769.

Amtrak contends that the term "political" as employed in its policy means to include (and therefore prohibit) all advertisements that do not seek to sell a product or service. However, that is certainly not what the term "political" is generally understood to mean, and, as noted, this is not how the relevant personnel understand the policy. When a standard for governmental control of speech is so unclear, there is a high likelihood of inconsistent and discriminatory application. Such a vague policy provides Amtrak officials with precisely the kind of unfettered discretion to control speech that the Supreme Court has held to contravene the First Amendment. *See, e.g., FW/PBS, Inc.*, 493 U.S. at 226; *Lakewood*, 486 U.S. at 757; *Shuttlesworth v. Birmingham*, 394 U.S. 147, 151 (1969); *Saia v. New York*, 334 U.S. 558, 560 (1948) ("There are no standards prescribed for the exercise of [the official's] discretion."); *see generally Staub v. City of Baxley*, 355 U.S. 313, 322 (1958) ("It is settled by a long line of recent decisions of this Court that an ordinance which . . . makes the

peaceful enjoyment of freedoms with the Constitution guarantees contingent upon the uncontrolled will of an official—as by requiring a permit or license which may be granted or withheld in the discretion of such official—is an unconstitutional censorship or prior restraint upon the enjoyment of those freedoms.").

(iii) *Not consistently applied.* A further infirmity in Amtrak's "no political advertisements" policy is that it is not consistently applied. As noted above, the policy is unknown to Amtrak's leasing agent, with the result that billboard space in Penn Station has repeatedly been leased for advertisements that are "political" in the sense of Amtrak's definition. Indeed, the licensing agreement between Amtrak and TDI expressly allows for public service advertisements (at reduced rates or no charge). And TDI maintains written *Guidelines For Public Service Advertising*. They provide that such advertising will be displayed (at less than full rate) for no more than a thirty-day period, only when space is available and may be pre-empted by any commercial (*i.e.*, full rate) advertising. The guidelines are designed to insure that such noncommercial advertisements shall be accepted only from "recognized, legitimate [tax exempt] not-for-profit organizations, corporations, National, State or Local government agencies and subdivisions, philanthropic or cultural organizations whose activities would be of interest or benefit to a majority of the area population," and that the advertisements adhere to "good taste, decency and community standards." It is clear that all of the advertisements covered by the Guidelines for Public Service Advertising are of the type that Amtrak contends are prohibited by its rule.

Furthermore, TDI's leasing guidelines do recognize a distinction affecting advertisements that are "political." The TDI guideline, however, does not reject them, but rather considers them commercial and therefore subject to full rate charge.[11]

---

[11] Particularly baffling in the context of this case is the TDI guideline that states:

(*footnote continued*)

It is clear beyond dispute that Amtrak's policy is not being consistently followed. TDI's records show that it leases space to advertisers that are not "commercial," and some of which are arguably "political." These include the New York Department of the Environment, the New York Department of Commerce, a foundation for muscular dystrophy, and *Plain Truth* magazine, a free magazine on political and social issues published by The Worldwide Church of God. In addition, testimony of the general counsel of TDI indicates that TDI regularly displays public service advertisements, including subjects such as the homeless, the environment, drunk driving, AIDS awareness, health issues, and race relations.[12]

(iv) *Void for viewpoint bias.* Furthermore, depending on which of the many proffered versions really is Amtrak's policy, the policy may also be void because of discrimination based on viewpoint. *See Perry Educ. Ass'n*, 460 U.S. at 45-46.

If, for example, Amtrak's policy, as Mr. DeAngelo sometimes testified, is directed against divisive, controversial, or objectionable matter, or if, as set forth in the 1967 and 1980 agreements with TDI, it gives Amtrak discretion to refuse any advertising involving "views which could result in dissension or involve [Amtrak] in dissension, complaints or controversy with its patrons or the public . . . ," it would be void; gov-

---

> Because of the separation of Church and State dictates of our Constitution, organizations that are primarily religious in structure *do not* qualify for Public Service space.

(Emphasis in original).

[12] Amtrak contends that its policy has been consistently applied with respect to the Spectacular, as it has never had a political advertisement in that space. Amtrak does not contend, however, that its policy against political advertisements applies only to the Spectacular. But even if it did, the policy would nonetheless be void for the first two reasons discussed: that it is not written or clearly disseminated and that it is too vague to be consistently applied (and also perhaps for the fourth reason discussed, that it is viewpoint-based censorship, depending on the meaning of Amtrak's policy).

ernment may not regulate speech by such criteria. *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397, 414 (1989). "[T]he use of the controversial nature of speech as the effective touchstone for regulation 'threatens a value at the very core of the First Amendment, the "profound national commitment to the principle that debate on public issues should be uninhibited, robust, and wide-open." ' " *U.S. Southwest Africa/Namibia Trade & Cultural Council*, 708 F.2d at 769 (quoting *Consolidated Edison Co. v. Public Service Commission*, 447 U.S. 530, 548 n.9 (1980) (Stevens, J., concurring) (quoting *New York Times v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, 270 (1964))). An advertisement such as Lebron's

> cannot be prohibited . . . merely because it provokes disagreements and offends the sensibilities of the majority. "Speech is often provocative and challenging. It may strike at prejudices and preconceptions and have profound unsettling effects as it presses for acceptance of an idea." It is precisely this speech for which the protection of the First Amendment was intended.

Penthouse International, Ltd. v. Koch, 599 F. Supp. 1338, 1350 (S.D.N.Y. 1984) (citation omitted); *see also Terminiello v. City of Chicago*, 337 U.S. 1, 4 (1949) ("A function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute."); *United States v. Schwimmer*, 279 U.S. 644, 654-55 (1929) (Holmes, J., dissenting) ("not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate").

If the policy is as set forth in TDI's guidelines, whether for Public Service Advertising or for Commercial Advertising, it is void for the same reason, for these guidelines are designed to ensure against advertising that is controversial, in bad taste, or inconsistent with the taste and preferences of the majority of the community. Such standards are of course permissible for a private actor, but not for a governmental actor or an actor whose symbiotic relationship with government renders the act of regulation governmental. Because Amtrak is saturated with the presence of the federal government, it may not

regulate speech in an effort to shield its customers from the abrasive, the obnoxious, the controversial.

Conclusion

Plaintiff Lebron has convincingly demonstrated that in rejecting his contract to display his art on its billboard Amtrak was engaged in governmental action and that the standards employed by Amtrak in rejecting his work violated its obligations under the First Amendment.[13]

Defendants are accordingly directed to give plaintiff immediate access to the Spectacular in accordance with his contract.

Dated: New York, N.Y.
February 5, 1993

SO ORDERED:

Pierre N. Leval, U.S.D.J.

[13] I do not reach Lebron's alternative contract theory because this resolution makes it superfluous.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Filed January 8, 1998
Docket No. 97-9505

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Appellant-Plaintiff,

—vs.—

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Appellee-Defendant,

TRANSPORTATION DISPLAYS INCORPORATED,

Defendant.

Each motion must be accompanied by a supporting affidavit.
(Local Rule 27(a))

NOTICE OF MOTION FOR STIPULATION OF SUMMARY AFFIRMANCE

MOTION BY: *(Name, address and tel. no. of law firm and of attorney in charge of case)*

Gloria C. Phares, Esq.
Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
(212) 336-2000

Has consent of opposing counsel:

A. been sought	☒ Yes	☐ No
B. been obtained	☒ Yes	☐ No
Has service been effected?	☒ Yes	☐ No
Is oral argument desired? *(Substantive motions only)*	☐ Yes	☒ No

Requested return date: None requested, motion by stipulation *(See Second Circuit Rule 27(b).)*

Has argument date of appeal been set:

A. by scheduling order?	☒ Yes	☐ No
B. by firm date/argument notice?	☐ Yes	☒ No

C. If yes, enter date: March 9, 1998

OPPOSING COUNSEL: *(Name, address and tel. no. of law firm and of attorney in charge of case)*

William G. Ballaine, Esq.
Landman, Corsi, Ballaine & Ford P.C.
120 Broadway
New York, NY 10271
(212) 238-4500

EMERGENCY MOTIONS, MOTIONS FOR STAYS
& INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL

Has request for relief been made below? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(See F.R.A.P. Rule 8)

Would expedited appeal eliminate need for this motion?
☐ Yes ☒ No

If no, explain why not: Requesting the summary affirmance of the district court's judgment dismissing Appellant's complaint

Will the parties agree to maintain the status quo until the motion is heard? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Judge or agency whose order is being appealed:
Judge Whitman Knapp

Brief statement of the relief requested:
(Complete, also, Page 2 of this form.)

Stipulated motion to have this Court summarily affirm the district court's judgment dismissing Appellant's complaint.

/s/ GLORIA C. PHARES
By: *(Signature of Attorney)*

Signed name must must be printed beneath.
Gloria C. Phares

Date: January 7, 1998

/s/ MICHAEL A. LEBRON
Appearing for: *(Name of Party)*

Appellant or Petitioner: ☒ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant

Appellee or Respondent: ☐ Plaintiff ☐ Defendant

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion be and it hereby is granted

FOR THE COURT
GEORGE LANGE III, Clerk

by: /s/ Beth J. Meador
Beth J. Meador, Administrative Attorney

THE CERTIFIED (✔) ORDER ( ) NOTICE
( ) STATEMENT OF COSTS
HAS BEEN RECEIVED BY /s/ AS
DATE: 1/22/98

Filed January 14, 1998

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 15 1998
CLERK

(2)

No. 97-1684

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

MICHAEL A. LEBRON
Petitioner,

v.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),
Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals For the Second Circuit

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

KEVIN T. BAINE*
STEVEN M. FARINA
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-5000

Counsel for Respondent National Railroad Passenger Corporation

Of Counsel:
SARAH H. DUGGIN
RICHARD G. SLATTERY
NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORP.
60 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

*Counsel of Record

34 pp

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the First Amendment requires that Amtrak permit the display of a concededly political ad on the billboard that dominates the entrance to Pennsylvania Station in New York City, when Amtrak's policy and practice has been to prohibit political advertising.

RULE 29.1 LISTING

The National Railroad Passenger Corporation has no parent companies or subsidiaries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED i

RULE 29.1 LISTING ii

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 1

A. Background 2

1. *The Spectacular* 2

2. *Amtrak's Rejection of Petitioner's "Advertorial* 5

B. The Decisions Below 6

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION 10

I. THE COURT OF APPEALS CORRECTLY APPLIED THIS COURT'S PUBLIC FORUM DECISIONS 10

A. This Court's public forum doctrine is clear and well-defined 10

B. This Court has applied the public forum doctrine to uphold a policy that is indistinguishable from the policy asserted by Amtrak 12

II. THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH THE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT OR THOSE OF OTHER CIRCUITS 14

A. There is no conflict over how to assess the nature of the forum 14

B. There is no conflict over whether a policy against political advertising amounts to viewpoint discrimination 19

C. There is no conflict over whether a policy against political advertising is unconstitutionally vague 23

CONCLUSION 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

AIDS Action Comm. v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth., 42 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 1994)..... 15, 21

Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Dept. of Aviation, 45 F.3d 1144 (7th Cir. 1995)..... 15, 17, 21

Bible Fellowship, Inc. v. Maine School Admin. Dt. #5, 941 F.2d 45 (1st Cir. 1991)..... 15

Church on the Rock v. City of Albuquerque, 84 F.3d 1273 (10th Cir. 1996) 21

City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Pub. Co., 486 U.S. 750 (1988) 24

Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund, Inc., 473 U.S. 788 (1985).....*passim*

Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell, 425 U.S. 610 (1976) ..23-24

International Society For Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee, 505 U.S. 672 (1992).....*passim*

Lambs Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School Dt., 508 U.S. 384 (1993) .....*passim*

Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, 418 U.S. 298 (1974) .....*passim*

Perry Education Ass'n v. Perry Local Educators Ass'n, 460 U.S. 37 (1983) .....*passim*

Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the University of Virginia, 515 U.S. 819 (1995).....20-22

Stewart v. District of Columbia Armory Bd.., 863 F.2d 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1988) 15

United States v. Kokinda, 497 U.S. 720 (1990) 13, 16

IN THE

Supreme Court Of The United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

No. 97-1684

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Petitioner,

v.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

---

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The petitioner in this case seeks to compel the National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("Amtrak") to

permit the display of a concededly political advertisement—an ad attacking the political activities of the Coors family, owners of the Coors Brewing Company—on the massive "Spectacular" billboard that dominates the entrance to Pennsylvania Station in New York. Amtrak rejected petitioner's political advertisement pursuant to the corporation's longstanding policy of limiting the Spectacular to commercial advertising.

Applying this Court's "public forum" doctrine, the court of appeals held that Amtrak's refusal to accept political advertising on the Spectacular was reasonable and viewpoint-neutral, and that petitioner therefore had no First Amendment right to display his advertisement on the Spectacular. Pet. App. 4a. That decision does not warrant review because it does not conflict with any decision of this Court or any decision of another court of appeals. Rather, the decision was based on well-established principles of public forum law and a decision of this Court, *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298 (1974), that is indistinguishable on the facts.

A. Background

1. *The Spectacular*

On the west side of the upper level of Penn Station, dominating the main entrance to Amtrak's waiting room and ticket area, is a curved, 103-foot long by 10-foot high illuminated billboard known as "the Spectacular."

Pet. App. 4a.[1] As anyone who has been in Penn Station can attest, it is virtually impossible not to notice the Spectacular as one enters the Amtrak terminal and descends on the escalators that directly face it. C.A.App. 1177. In the words of the district court, its presence is "inescapable." C.A.App. 139.

The Spectacular was constructed in 1967 by Transportation Displays, Incorporated ("TDI"), a privately-held advertising agency, pursuant to a contract with the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, which then owned Penn Station. The contract gave TDI the right to "construct and maintain, at [its] own cost and expense, an advertising Spectacular display for sale to advertisers." E. 188. TDI agreed to pay the railroad a percentage of the gross receipts derived from advertising displayed on the Spectacular, and it agreed further that no advertisement would be displayed without prior approval of the railroad. E. 190, 192.

Amtrak, which now owns Penn Station and exercises complete control over the area where the Spectacular is located, has continued essentially the same arrangement that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company had with TDI. The contract now in effect between Amtrak and TDI authorizes TDI to sell advertising space on the Spectacular and in other locations, and provides that TDI shall pay Amtrak a percentage of its net receipts. E. 3. It also expressly provides that "[a]ll advertising material, exhibit material, notices and advertisements and their manner of

---

[1] Citations to Pet. App. are to pages of the Appendix to the Petition. Citations to C.A.App. and E. are to pages of the joint appendix and exhibit volumes in the court of appeals.

presentation and design, shall be subject to approval by Amtrak." E. 5.

Advertising on the Spectacular (which sells for nearly $20,000 per month) has been overseen at all relevant times by Amtrak's Real Estate and Operations Development Department. E. 2345. The Vice President for that Department, Anthony DeAngelo, applies Amtrak's advertising policies and makes the final decision whether to approve ads for the Spectacular. C.A.App. 106-08.

Political advertising has *always* been prohibited on the Spectacular. C.A.App. 107, 365-66, 813-15, 823-24, 844. In fact, the Pennsylvania Railroad Company adopted this policy in 1967 when the Spectacular was first built—before Amtrak even existed. C.A.App. 365-66, 813-15; E. 192. Amtrak continued the policy when it assumed control over the Spectacular in 1976 because, like the Pennsylvania Railroad, it recognized that partisan displays might offend or anger some of its customers. In the nearly three decades since its construction, no remotely political or other noncommercial advertisement has ever appeared on the Spectacular.[2] As Chief Judge Newman noted in dissent below, "Amtrak's billboard space in Pennsylvania Station . . . has not become a forum for ads of such pointed political content as Lebron's attack on the makers of Coors beer for promoting 'The Far Right's

---

[2] The only ads that have appeared on the Spectacular are those promoting the DuPont Company, Resorts International in Atlantic City, the Broadway play "Sophisticated Ladies," Fujitsu computers, Nike athletic wear, and A&S Department Store. Pet. App. 7a.

political agenda.'" *Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 12 F.3d 388, 394 (2d Cir. 1993).

2. *Amtrak's Rejection of Petitioner's "Advertorial"*

Petitioner's proposed "advertorial," as he calls it, is a photomontage of convivial Coors beer drinkers, juxtaposed with a scene in which Nicaraguan villagers are menaced by a flaming Coors beer can hurtling toward them like a missile. In addition to its powerful visual image, the advertorial contains considerable text, superimposed on an American flag, which is sharply critical of the Coors family's support of "the Far Right's political agenda." Pet. App. 5a.[3]

On November 30, 1992, petitioner signed a contract with TDI to display his work for two months on the Spectacular. Pet. App. 4a. Petitioner knew when he signed the TDI contract that Amtrak retained the right to reject his ad. Pet. App. 4a. And he anticipated that there might be objection to the display of his advertorial on the Spectacular because of its "unusual nature." As he conceded, "[i]t wasn't commercial in the way they are used to." C.A.App. 228. In fact, "because of the subject matter" of his work, petitioner deliberately avoided disclosing its content to TDI until December 2, 1992, two days after he signed the TDI contract. C.A. App. 201-03, 211.

On December 17, Amtrak's Vice President, Anthony DeAngelo, first learned of petitioner's

---

[3] The full text of petitioner's advertorial is reprinted in the Appendix to this Brief in Opposition.

proposed ad. He immediately rejected it as political. C.A.App. 107-08. In a letter dated December 23, 1992, DeAngelo notified TDI of his decision, invoking Amtrak's longstanding "policy that it will not allow political advertising on the spectacular' advertising sign." Pet. App. 5a; C.A.App. 114.[4]

TDI offered petitioner any one of 500 alternative sites in New York City, all of which he rejected. Pet. App. 5a. As petitioner explained, he considers the Spectacular "an extraordinarily unique advertising location in New York City." Pet. App. 6a.

B. The Decisions Below

Petitioner commenced this action on December 30, 1992, seeking an injunction requiring Amtrak to display his advertorial. The district court conducted a trial entirely on documentary submissions—including deposition transcripts, exhibits, stipulations, and admissions derived from each party's "mark-up" of proposed findings of fact submitted by the opposition.

---

[4] Petitioner contends that Amtrak's policy is "unwritten" and "undisseminated." Pet. 6. But when petitioner briefed the government action issue to this Court, he acknowledged that "[t]he advertising policy at issue here preceded DeAngelo's arrival at Amtrak . . . and is reflected in writing in Amtrak's leasing contracts." Brief for Petitioner (No. 93-1525), at 13. And although the policy may not have been widely disseminated to all Amtrak employees, what matters is that Anthony DeAngelo—the person who is responsible for overseeing third party advertising on the Spectacular and who rejected petitioner's ad—knew of and understood Amtrak's policy.

On February 5, 1993, the district court issued an opinion and order directing Amtrak to give petitioner immediate access to the Spectacular. The court held that Amtrak's decision to refuse to display petitioner's political advertorial on the Spectacular violated the First Amendment. Pet. App. 14c-22c. In reaching this conclusion, the district court ignored this Court's well-established public forum doctrine, which permits the government, when acting as proprietor rather than lawmaker, to control access to its property "based on subject matter and speaker identity so long as the distinctions drawn are reasonable in light of the purpose served by the forum and are viewpoint neutral." *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School District*, 508 U.S. 384, 392-93 (1993)(quotation omitted). The district court failed to define the forum at issue, failed to determine whether the Spectacular (or whatever else the court thought the forum to be) was a public or nonpublic forum, and failed even to mention—let alone distinguish—*Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298 (1974), a decision of this Court expressly upholding a municipal government's policy of prohibiting political advertising on city buses. The district court justified its holding that Amtrak must grant petitioner access to the Spectacular by applying *strict scrutiny*, in reliance on cases involving *public fora* open to all expressive activity. App. 14c-21c.

On October 30, 1995, in an opinion written by Judge Mahoney and joined by Judge Lumbard, the court of appeals reversed, holding that petitioner had no First Amendment right to display his advertorial on the

Spectacular. Pet. App. 4a.[5] Unlike the district court, the court of appeals applied public forum doctrine. Relying on this Court's decision in *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 788 (1985), the panel first determined that the relevant forum for purposes of analysis was the Spectacular, because petitioner sought access only to this unique property. Pet. App. 9a-10a. Next, the court of appeals looked to Amtrak's "policy and practice" to determine whether Amtrak "intended to designate" the Spectacular as a forum for political advertising. Pet. App. 10a (citing *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 802). The panel found that Amtrak's "practice is clear; it has never opened the Spectacular for anything except purely commercial advertising." Pet. App. 10a. The court concluded that "[i]n light of Amtrak's undisputed practice . . . the Spectacular is not a public forum." Pet. App. 11a.

Having determined that Amtrak had not intentionally designated the Spectacular an open forum for political speech, the panel turned to the question whether Amtrak's decision met the requisites established by this Court for regulating access to a non-public forum. Relying on this Court's decision in *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, supra*, which upheld a policy virtually identical to Amtrak's, the panel found

---

[5] The court of appeals initially held, on December 27, 1993, that Amtrak was not a governmental actor for constitutional purposes. 12 F.3d 388 (2d Cir. 1993). This Court reversed that decision, holding that Amtrak is bound by the First Amendment. 513 U.S. 374 (1995). The Court remanded the case for a determination whether Amtrak's refusal to display petitioner's advertorial violated the First Amendment—a question upon which this Court "express[ed] no opinion." *Id.* at 400.

Amtrak's policy to be both reasonable and viewpoint-neutral. Pet. App. 11a-16a. Accordingly, the court of appeals reversed the judgment and remanded the case with the instruction that the district court dismiss petitioner's complaint, leaving petitioner "free to pursue his state law claim in state court." Pet. App. 18a.

On December 29, 1995, the court of appeals amended its opinion in two respects. First, the panel corrected a factual error in the opinion. The court had written that Amtrak's prohibition against political advertising "was limited in scope to the Spectacular." Pet. App. 16a. Although Amtrak applies the policy differently to the Spectacular (conducting prior review and approval of all proposed advertisements), Amtrak prohibits political advertising on all of its property. C.A.App. 349-52. The court of appeals amended its opinion to reflect this fact. Pet. App. 3b. Second, the panel amended its disposition of petitioner's contract claim. Instead of leaving that claim for a state court to resolve, the panel instructed the district court on remand to rule on petitioner's contract claim.

Petitioner immediately filed a petition for a writ of certiorari, which this Court denied. 116 S. Ct. 1675 (1996).

On remand, the district court dismissed petitioner's contract claim. 981 F. Supp. 279 (S.D.N.Y. 1997). Petitioner appealed, but he raised only the constitutional issue that the court of appeals had already decided against him in 1995. The court of appeals affirmed based on the parties' stipulation that the prior court of appeals ruling was law of the case. Pet. App. 4d.

Petitioner now seeks for the second time to have this Court review the court of appeals' 1995 ruling.

REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION

The decision of the court of appeals involved a straightforward application of well-established First Amendment principles. It does not conflict with any decision of any other court. In fact, it does not present any significant legal issue at all, only petitioner's disagreement with how the court of appeals applied settled law to the facts of this case.

I. THE COURT OF APPEALS CORRECTLY APPLIED THIS COURT'S PUBLIC FORUM DECISIONS

The court of appeals applied legal principles that have been established by more than a half dozen decisions of this Court—one of which, *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, supra*, is directly on point.

A. This Court's public forum doctrine is clear and well-defined

It is "well settled" that even "the government need not permit all forms of speech on property that it owns and controls." *International Society For Krishna Consciousness, Inc. ("ISKCON") v. Lee*, 505 U.S. 672, 678 (1992). "With respect to public property that is not a designated public forum open for indiscriminate public use for communicative purposes," this Court has held that "'[c]ontrol over access . . . can be based on subject matter and speaker identity so long as the distinctions drawn are reasonable in light of the purpose served by the forum and are viewpoint neutral.'"

Lamb's Chapel, 508 U.S. at 392-93 (quoting *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 806).

"Not every instrumentality used for communication . . . is a . . . public forum by designation." *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 803. And the mere fact "[t]hat [expressive] activity occurs in the context of the forum created does not imply that the forum thereby becomes a public forum for First Amendment purposes." *Id.* at 805. "The government does not create a public forum by inaction or by permitting limited discourse, but only by intentionally opening a nontraditional forum for public discourse." *Id.* at 802; *see ISKCON*, 505 U.S. at 680; *Perry Education Ass'n v. Perry Local Educators' Ass'n*, 460 U.S. 37, 47 (1983).

The government may open a forum generally for expressive activity, or it may open a forum only "for a limited purpose such as use by certain groups . . . or for the discussion of certain subjects." *Id.* at 46 n.7 (citations omitted). When the government creates a limited public forum, the "right of access . . . extend[s] only to other entities of similar character." *Id.* at 48. Those seeking to engage in speech not previously permitted in the forum may be excluded, so long as such distinctions are "reasonable" and "not an effort to suppress the speaker's activity due to disagreement with the speaker's view." *ISKCON,* 505 U.S. at 679; *see Lamb's Chapel*, 508 U.S. at 392-93, *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 806; *Perry*, 460 U.S. at 46.

B. This Court has applied the public forum doctrine to uphold a policy that is indistinguishable from the policy asserted by Amtrak

Application of this well-established framework makes this case an easy one. Because Amtrak has not heretofore opened the Spectacular for political advertising, it need not open the Spectacular to petitioner for that purpose.

This Court's decision in *Lehman* is on point. In that case, the City of Shaker Heights prohibited all political advertisements on city-owned buses, while permitting commercial and service-oriented advertising. This Court upheld that policy, emphasizing the commercial nature of the city's enterprise:

> [T]he city is engaged in commerce. . . . The car card space, although incidental to the provision of public transportation, is a part of the commercial venture. In much the same way that a newspaper or periodical, or even a radio or television station, need not accept every proffer of advertising from the general public, a city transit system has discretion to develop and make reasonable choices concerning the type of advertising that may be displayed in its vehicles.

418 U.S. at 303 (plurality opinion). The plurality reasoned that in such circumstances, a governmental limitation on access to property it controls is valid so long as the policy is not "arbitrary, capricious, or invidious." *Id.* Under that standard, the city's prohibition against political advertisements was permissible. Absent the policy, the plurality reasoned,

> [u]sers [of the buses] would be subjected to the blare of political propaganda. There could be lurking doubts about favoritism, and sticky administrative problems might arise in parceling out limited space to eager politicians. In these circumstances, the managerial decision to limit car card space to innocuous and less controversial commercial and service oriented advertising does not rise to the dignity of a First Amendment violation. Were we to hold to the contrary, display cases in public hospitals, libraries, office buildings, military compounds, and other public facilities immediately would become Hyde Parks open to every would-be pamphleteer and politician. This the Constitution does not require.

Id. at 304. Precisely the same reasoning is applicable here. As the court of appeals explained, citing *Lehman*, "Amtrak's decision, as proprietor, to decline to enter the political arena, even indirectly, by displaying political advertisements is certainly reasonable." Pet. App. 14a.[6]

---

[6] Petitioner contends that "*Lehman* rests on a captive audience rationale not applicable here." Pet. 23 n.23. This Court has declined to so limit its decision in *Lehman*. *See ISKCON*, 505 U.S. at 678; *United States v. Kokinda*, 497 U.S. 720, 725-26 (1990), *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 801-803-04, 806, 808-09; *Perry*, 460 U.S. at 49 n.9. In any event, the Amtrak riders who are forced to confront the 103 foot-long Spectacular as they descend the escalator at the entrance to Penn Station are no less "captive" than the audience that viewed the ads inside and outside the transit cars in *Lehman*.

II. THE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH THE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT OR THOSE OF OTHER CIRCUITS

Petitioner suggests that there are conflicts between the decision of the court of appeals and the decisions of this Court and other circuits. But there are no conflicts—only petitioner's disagreement with how the court of appeals saw the facts. And the factual issues that petitioner raises are not worthy of this Court's attention.

A. There is no conflict over how to assess the nature of the forum

Petitioner says that the court of appeals accepted Amtrak's *post hoc* assertion of policy over evidence of contrary past practice in determining that Amtrak had not opened the Spectacular to political advertising, and that this approach conflicts with other courts' insistence on examining past practice. But the supposed conflict is nonexistent. The court of appeals did not reject the relevance of past practice. To the contrary, its ruling rested explicitly on evidence of past practice. The court noted that Amtrak's "practice is clear; it has never opened the Spectacular for anything except purely commercial advertising." Pet. App. 10a. *See also* Pet. App. 11a ("In light of Amtrak's undisputed practice with respect to the Spectacular, . . . we conclude that the Spectacular is not a public forum . . . . ").

The court of appeals decision does not conflict with the decisions of other courts that have insisted on an examination of the government's actual practice with regard to various speakers. In fact, the court of appeals

cited, quoted and explicitly relied upon those decisions. *See* Pet. App. 10a (quoting *Air Line Pilots Association v. Department of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144, 1154 (7th Cir. 1995)("a court must examine the actual policy—as gleaned from the consistent practice with regard to various speakers—to determine whether a state intended to create a designated public forum") and citing *AIDS Action Committee v. Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority*, 42 F.3d 1, 10-12 (1st Cir. 1994)).[7]

Petitioner's real argument is not that the court of appeals disregarded Amtrak's past practices, but that on the specific facts of this case the court should have viewed those practices differently. But that is not an argument that reflects any conflict among the circuits or that warrants this Court's attention for any other reason. And it is not an argument that has merit in any event.

Petitioner argues that the court of appeals should have recognized that Amtrak allowed political advertising *elsewhere* in Penn Station. But there are several problems with that argument:

First, the relevant forum is not Penn Station as a whole, but the Spectacular, which is the only forum to which petitioner sought access. In the courts below, petitioner argued that Penn Station is the relevant forum.

---

[7] The other cases cited by petitioner—*Grace Bible Fellowship, Inc. v. Maine School Admin. Dt. #5*, 941 F.2d 45, 47 (1st Cir. 1991), and *Stewart v. District of Columbia Armory Bd.*, 863 F.2d 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1988), for example—merely reaffirm the point, about which there is no disagreement, that objective evidence of past practice can constitute evidence of intent to create a public forum or not.

In his Petition, however, he no longer explicitly presses that point, for good reason.

In a long line of unvarying authority, this Court has made plain that the forum is defined by "the access sought by the speaker." *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 801. "When speakers seek general access to public property, the forum encompasses that property. In cases in which limited access is sought, [this Court's] cases have taken a more tailored approach to ascertaining the perimeters of a forum within the confines of the government property." *Id.* (citation omitted).[8]

Petitioner did not seek general access to Amtrak property, to Penn Station, or even to the advertising spaces located within Penn Station. Petitioner sought access only to the Spectacular because, in his words, that forum provides "an extraordinarily unique

---

[8] For example, in *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, where plaintiffs sought to compel the city to permit political advertising on city-owned buses, "the Court treated the advertising spaces on the buses as the forum." *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 801; *see Lehman*, 418 U.S. at 303. Similarly, in *Perry Education Association v. Perry Local Educators' Association*, where the plaintiffs sought access to a school's internal mail system and teachers' mailboxes, the Court defined the forum as those internal mail facilities and not the school generally. 460 U.S. at 46. In *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund*, where legal defense and political advisory organizations sought to be included in the Combined Federal Campaign ("CFC"), an annual charitable fundraising drive conducted in the federal workplace, the Court defined the forum as the CFC, not the federal workplace. 473 U.S. at 800-01. And in *United States v. Kokinda*, where the plaintiffs sought to "solicit alms and contributions" on a postal sidewalk, the plurality focused on whether the sidewalk, and not the entire post office, was a public or nonpublic forum. 497 U.S. at 727-37.

advertising location." Pet. App. 6a. Petitioner maintains, and Amtrak agrees, that due to its size, location, and prominence, there is no other advertising space in Penn Station that commands the same attention or offers a comparable vehicle to reach Amtrak passengers. Pet. App. 5a-6a. Because the Spectacular is a unique forum, and because petitioner seeks access to it alone, the court of appeals properly framed the issue in this case to be whether Amtrak has intentionally designated the Spectacular as a forum for political advertising.

Second, although Amtrak prohibits political advertising anywhere on its property, the application of that policy to the Spectacular differs in one critical respect: due to the Spectacular's size, location and prominence—and because there is no equivalent forum in Penn Station—Amtrak subjects only those advertisements slated to appear on the Spectacular to prior review and approval. C.A.App. 366. Amtrak's policy of prior approval on the Spectacular ensures that political ads will not appear in that forum through inadvertence, and establishes beyond doubt its intent to "exercise control over the subject matter of the displays." *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 804 (discussing *Lehman*).

Petitioner contends that the court of appeals' focus on the Spectacular alone, rather than all advertising spaces in Penn Station, conflicts with the decision of the Seventh Circuit in *Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Department of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144 (7th Cir. 1995). Before the Second Circuit, however, petitioner affirmatively recognized that the Seventh Circuit's decision in *Air Line Pilots* "supports Amtrak's argument that the

Spectacular is the relevant forum [because] the court found that the forum is defined in terms of the access sought by the speaker." Supplemental Letter Brief (5/5/95) (quotation omitted). That concession was correct. Applying *Cornelius*, the Seventh Circuit held that the district court erred in defining the relevant forum as O'Hare airport, rather than the advertising display cases to which the plaintiff sought access. 45 F.3d at 1151-52. Petitioner notes that the court did not limit itself to analysis of a single diorama or concourse. But that is because no one had suggested that one diorama was different from another, or that the airport applied its policy differently from one diorama to another. In short, no one argued to the court that it should limit its analysis to a single diorama. Here, by contrast, petitioner sought access to a very specific space—the only advertising space of its kind, and the only space for which Amtrak exercised a right of prior review and approval.

Third, even if Amtrak's practices elsewhere in Penn Station were relevant, they are not as they have been characterized by petitioner. It is simply not true that Amtrak "repeatedly displayed noncommercial, political advertisements in Penn Station." Pet. 14. There were, as the court of appeals noted, a "handful of assertedly borderline" ads that had appeared elsewhere in Penn Station, Pet. App. 18a—ads that the district court found were "not 'commercial,' and some of which are *arguably political*," Pet. App. 20c (emphasis added). But a few "arguably political" ads elsewhere in Penn Station hardly establish any practice contrary to

Amtrak's stated policy of disallowing political ads on the Spectacular.[9]

B. There is no conflict over whether a policy against political advertising amounts to viewpoint discrimination

It is well settled that even in a nonpublic forum the government cannot engage in discrimination on the basis of viewpoint. But it is equally well settled that a policy against all political advertising does not constitute viewpoint discrimination. Under such a policy, it is the political subject that is off limits, not any particular view on the subject. That is why this Court found no impermissible viewpoint discrimination in *Lehman*, and that is why there is no impermissible viewpoint discrimination in this case.

Petitioner suggests, however, that *Lehman* has been overtaken by this Court's decisions in *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches Union Free School District*, 508 U.S.

---

[9] The record discloses nothing whatsoever about the content of three of the ads mentioned by the district court—ads placed by the New York Departments of Commerce and the Environment and the Foundation for Muscular Dystrophy. The fourth ad—a paid ad for Plain Truth magazine—promotes a product, the magazine. The placement of that ad in Penn Station is consistent with the acceptance of advertisements for publications without regard to the publication's content. E. 261, E. 347. Both the panel majority and the dissent found that these "assertedly borderline cases" were of a different kind than petitioner's advertorial. Pet. App. 18a. As Chief Judge Newman explained in dissent from the first court of appeals decision, "Amtrak's billboard space in Pennsylvania Station, even if used in the past for ads of a public service nature, has not become a forum for ads of such pointed political content as Lebron's . . . ." 12 F.3d at 394.

384 (1993), and *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of the University of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995). But those decisions merely confirm that the government cannot "'den[y] access to a speaker solely to suppress the point of view he espouses on an otherwise includible subject.'" *Lamb's Chapel*, 508 U.S. at 394 (quoting *Cornelius*, 473 U.S. at 806). Thus, in *Lamb's Chapel*, the Court held that a public school district engaged in impermissible viewpoint discrimination by opening a forum "to be used for the presentation of all views about family issues and child rearing except those dealing with the subject matter from a religious standpoint." *Id.* at 393. And in *Rosenberger*, the Court held that the University of Virginia had engaged in viewpoint discrimination by denying funding to a student newspaper solely because of the paper's religious views. As in *Lamb's Chapel*, what triggered the decision was " [t]he prohibited perspective, not the general subject matter." 515 U.S. at 831.

The decision below does not conflict with *Lamb's Chapel* and *Rosenberger*. Amtrak did not prohibit a particular view or perspective about the Nicaraguan Civil War, the political agenda of the Coors family, or the broader subject that petitioner claims to have addressed in his advertorial—the "influence of a powerful, urban, materialistic and individualistic culture on rural, community based, family-oriented and religious cultures." Pet. App. 4a-5a. Those are not "subject[s] otherwise permissible" for discussion on the Spectacular. *Lamb's Chapel*, 508 U.S. at 394. Amtrak has never opened the Spectacular (or any other advertising space in Penn Station) for speakers to address such subjects—regardless of whether they

espouse liberal or conservative, religious or secular, or any other views.

For the same reason, the decision below does not conflict with the decisions of the various courts of appeals quoting or applying the lessons of *Lamb's Chapel* and *Rosenberger*. In *Air Line Pilots Association*, 45 F.3d at 1159, the Seventh Circuit in dictum merely quoted *Lamb's Chapel's* language inviting analysis of whether the proposed speech dealt with a subject that was "otherwise permissible" in the forum. In *Church on the Rock v. City of Albuquerque*, 84 F.3d 1273 (10th Cir. 1996), the court found viewpoint discrimination in a policy that permitted discussion of religion, including Christianity, but prohibited advocating the adoption of the Christian faith. The evil of such a policy, the court explained, was that the decision to bar the speech at issue was "'[t]he prohibited perspective, not the general subject matter.'" *Id.* at 1279 (quoting *Rosenberger*, 515 U.S. at 831). And in *AIDS Action Comm. v. Massachusetts Bay Transp. Auth.*, 42 F.3d 1, 7 (1st Cir. 1994), the court found "the appearance of viewpoint discrimination" under a very specific set of facts: after allowing a sexually explicit ad for a movie and sexually explicit ads promoting the use of condoms, and after receiving public letters (many described by the court as "homophobic") protesting the condom ads, the city refused a subsequent ad promoting condoms on the stated ground that it was sexually explicit. The appearance was that the city was not really opposed to sexually explicit material, but to the particular message conveyed by the ad promoting condom use.

There is no basis in this case for a belief that Amtrak was discriminating against petitioner's particular viewpoint or perspective, because it had never displayed any ad that was remotely like his. As even the dissent below acknowledged: "Amtrak's billboard space in Pennsylvania Station, even if used in the past for ads of a public service nature, has not become a forum for ads of such pointed political content" as petitioner's advertorial. 12 F.3d at 394.

Petitioner attempts to force this case into the *Lamb's Chapel* and *Rosenberger* mold by suggesting that his ad simply addressed a subject that was permissible—whether to buy Coors beer—from a particular perspective. The court of appeals, however, correctly rejected this argument as "plainly specious." Pet. App. 16a n.4. "The 'subject matter' of the Display," the court explained, "can hardly be described, with any remote sense of accuracy, as the merits or demerits of Coors Beer. As Lebron himself stated in an affidavit, 'I do not seek to sell anything other than ideas with this advertisement.'" *Id.*

Had Amtrak permitted the expression of different views on the political subjects addressed in petitioner's advertorial, then the exclusion of petitioner's ad might amount to viewpoint discrimination. Or if Amtrak had allowed an ad urging the audience to buy Coors beer because of the Coors family's support for "The Far Right's political agenda," Pet. App. 5a, it might be required to permit an ad that urged people not to buy Coors for the same reason. But there is no viewpoint discrimination when Amtrak has never permitted political advertising of any kind on the Spectacular.

C. There is no conflict over whether a policy against political advertising is unconstitutionally vague

Petitioner contends that, notwithstanding this Court's decision in *Lehman*, Amtrak's policy of prohibiting political advertising on the Spectacular is unconstitutionally vague. But surely petitioner has no doubt that his ad falls outside the bounds of what Amtrak's policy permits. Amtrak has only allowed commercial advertising on the Spectacular, and petitioner has recognized that his advertorial "wasn't commercial in the way they are used to." C.A.App. 228. Amtrak does not permit "political" advertising on the Spectacular, and petitioner, a self-proclaimed "*political artist*," himself describes his advertorial as a "*political statement*." C.A.App. 8 (emphasis added). Thus, the very term that petitioner deems "vague" is one that he himself has used to distinguish his work from other types of advertising.

Petitioner interprets *Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell*, 425 U.S. 610 (1976), to hold the term "political . . . cause" unconstitutionally vague. Pet. 21-23. But the Court held no such thing. The ordinance at issue in *Hynes* required persons soliciting "for a Federal, State, County or Municipal political campaign or cause" to notify the local police department in writing of their proposed activities. 425 U.S. at 613. Those who failed to follow this procedure were subject to a criminal sanction. *Id.* at 615. This Court found that while "it is fairly clear what the phrase 'political campaign' comprehends . . . it is not clear what is meant by a 'Federal, State, County or Municipal . . . Cause.'" *Id.* at 621 (second set of ellipses

in original). The Court found only this latter phrase vague—not the term "political."[10]

The decision of this Court that is on point is *Lehman*, which upheld a ban on political advertising without any reservation that the term "political" might be unconstitutionally vague. Petitioner argues that "*Lehman* did not even address a vagueness claim." Pet. 23. But Justice Brennan argued strongly in dissent in *Lehman* that "[t]he line between ideological and nonideological speech is impossible to draw with accuracy"—that it is not "possible to draw a manageable line" of the kind drawn by a policy prohibiting political advertising. 418 U.S. at 319, 320. Those arguments were unpersuasive to the majority.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Petition should be denied.

---

[10] Nor is petitioner's argument supported by this Court's decision in *City of v. Plain Dealer Pub. Co.*, 486 U.S. 750 (1988). Pet. 22-23. The challenged ordinance in that case contained no standard whatsoever to guide the mayor in deciding whether to grant permission to place newsracks on public property. The mayor could deny permission for *any* reason. Amtrak's policy bears no resemblance to that ordinance.

Respectfully submitted

KEVIN T. BAINE*
STEVEN M. FARINA
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-5000

Counsel for Respondent
National Railroad
Passenger Corporation

Of Counsel:
SARAH H. DUGGIN
RICHARD G. SLATTERY
NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORP.
60 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

*Counsel of Record

May 15, 1998

APPENDIX

After a hard week's work, you're ready for the right place with the right one. Why make the right moment the right's moment? Coors Light not only has the taste that won't slow you down. It's the Silver Bullet that aims the Far Right's political agenda at the heart of America. Want the awesome facts? Then read between these lines.

Every year, the Coors family, owners of Coors Brewing Co., gives financial support to groups like The National Forum Foundation, Morality in Media, The Heritage Foundation and The Free Congress Foundation. They form part of a network that includes authoritarian religious and political extremists. When you buy Coors products, you help them turn back civil rights, censure [sic] high school textbooks, weaken labor laws and environmental protections, promote homophobia, and meddle in foreign affairs. Did you know Joe Coors himself bought an aircraft for the Nicaraguan contras?

Where are the Nicaraguan contras today? El Loco says "Once, we were glad to have Joe Coors and his friends on our side. Together, we fought the hard and dirty fight that drove Nicaraguans to the voting booth to make The Right's Choice for a Better Nicaragua! Now the shooting war is over; after 30,000 dead, I can walk into my favorite Managua bar and say, 'No more of that industrial strength Nicaraguan cervesa for me. Gimme the great taste of Coors Light!" But my family, and Nicaraguan families everywhere, are poorer than ever. With 55% unemployed, we scour garbage heaps for food in the villages we ravaged. What happened to all that promised U.S. aid? What does it really mean to say that Coors Light is the Right's Beer now?"

E. 2210-18 (footnotes omitted).

No. 97-1684

(3)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 26 1998
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Petitioner,

—v.—

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

REPLY MEMORANDUM OF PETITIONER

GLORIA C. PHARES
JEFFREY H. BLUM
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB & TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 336-2000

DAVID D. COLE
Counsel of Record
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 662-9078

R. BRUCE RICH
BERNADETTE M. MCCANN EZRING
JONATHAN BLOOM
MARC BROTMAN
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153
(212) 310-8000

Attorneys for Petitioner

13 pp

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE PANEL'S DECISION TO TREAT AS LEGALLY IRRELEVANT TO PUBLIC FORUM ANALYSIS THE GOVERNMENT'S APPLICATION OF THE CHALLENGED POLICY AND THE NATURE OF THE FORUM RENDERS THE PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINE A RUBBER STAMP OF GOVERNMENT DECISIONS 2

II. THE COURT OF APPEALS' DETERMINATION THAT AMTRAK'S POLICY WAS VIEWPOINT-NEUTRAL CONFLICTS WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND OTHER COURTS OF APPEALS 7

III. AMTRAK'S POLICY IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE UNDER *HYNES V. MAYOR OF ORADELL* 8

CONCLUSION 10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	PAGE
Arkansas Educational Television Comm'n v. Forbes, 1998 WL 244196 (U.S. Sup. Ct. May 18, 1998)..	4
Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Department of Aviation, 45 F.3d 1144 (7th Cir. 1995).....	5, 6
Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Ed. Fund, Inc., 473 U.S. 788 (1985)	4
Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell, 425 U.S. 610 (1976).....	8, 9
Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., (Amtrak), 69 F.3d 650 (2d Cir. 1995).....	2, 3, 6, 8
Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., (Amtrak), 89 F.3d 39 (2d Cir. 1995)	3, 5
Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., (Amtrak), 811 F. Supp. 993 (S.D.N.Y. 1993)	2, 3, 5, 6, 9
Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights, 418 U.S. 298 (1974)	9
United States v. Kokinda, 497 U.S. 720 (1990).....	2
Widmar v. Vincent, 454 U.S. 263 (1981).....	4

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1997

No. 97-1684

MICHAEL A. LEBRON,

Petitioner,

—v.—

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION (AMTRAK),

Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

REPLY MEMORANDUM OF PETITIONER

INTRODUCTION

Respondent's brief in opposition seeks to obscure the central issue in this case: whether the public forum doctrine requires courts to examine the objective characteristics of a forum and the government's actual practice in implementing its asserted policy, or whether the doctrine permits a court to accept the government's *post hoc* assertion of an unwritten policy and ignore objective evidence of contrary practices under that same policy.

This is not, as respondent suggests, a mere disagreement about how the court of appeals applied settled law to the

facts, but a fundamental question going to the legal scope and meaning of the public forum doctrine. As Justice Kennedy has observed, "[i]f our public forum jurisprudence is to retain vitality, we must recognize that certain objective characteristics of Government property and customary use by the public may control the case." *United States v. Kokinda*, 497 U.S. 720, 737-38 (1990) (Kennedy, J., concurring). The court of appeals' approach to the public forum doctrine drains the doctrine of its vitality, and deprives it of any speech-protective function.

I. THE PANEL'S DECISION TO TREAT AS LEGALLY IRRELEVANT TO PUBLIC FORUM ANALYSIS THE GOVERNMENT'S APPLICATION OF THE CHALLENGED POLICY AND THE NATURE OF THE FORUM RENDERS THE PUBLIC FORUM DOCTRINE A RUBBER STAMP OF GOVERNMENT DECISIONS

The court of appeals determined that Amtrak had not created a public forum because it had "never opened the Spectacular for anything except purely commercial advertising." Pet. App. 10a. In order to reach this conclusion, the court deemed legally irrelevant undisputed evidence that Amtrak had displayed noncommercial advertisements under the same policy that governed the Spectacular.

The legal issue squarely presented, then, is whether public forum doctrine permits a court to ignore evidence of inconsistent past practice in assessing the nature of the forum. Amtrak concedes that its policy against political advertising, which it asserted in rejecting petitioner's ad, applies not just to the Spectacular bulletin board, but to all Penn Station advertising. Br. in Opp. 9. And the district court found that under that same policy Amtrak had permitted the display of numerous noncommercial ads throughout Penn Station. Pet. App. 20c. Thus, as Judge Jon O. Newman pointed out in dissent, "[t]he majority has concluded that the policy has been

consistently applied by overlooking the instances where it has not been consistently applied."[1] Pet. App. 5b.

The court of appeals' decision to ignore objective evidence of Amtrak's inconsistent practices with respect to political speech was neither an oversight nor a mere error in applying the law to the facts. The panel was fully aware of the contrary evidence, but deemed it legally irrelevant to the public forum inquiry.[2]

Moreover, the court below also treated as legally irrelevant objective evidence regarding the nature of the forum, including evidence that Penn Station is a major public thoroughfare with which political speech is fully compatible, and in which a wide range of other political speech has been communicated and displayed, without any adverse reactions from Amtrak's

---

[1] Amtrak states that the district court "ignored" this Court's public forum doctrine and "failed" to "define the forum at issue, . . . [or] determine whether the Spectacular . . . was a public or nonpublic forum . . . ," Br. in Opp. 7, without mentioning that public forum analysis was not necessary to the district court's holdings that Amtrak's policy was impermissibly vague, Pet. App. 15c-19c, and, depending on its meaning, might constitute viewpoint discrimination, *id.* 20c-22c. As Judge Newman pointed out, "the public forum view of the majority, even if correct, is irrelevant since, no matter what the scope of the forum, a governmental entity violates the First Amendment when it bars display of political messages pursuant to a 'policy' that has been found . . . to be vague, unwritten, undisseminated, unclear to those who administer it, and inconsistently applied." *Id.* 6b (emphasis supplied).

[2] The panel initially justified its decision to ignore the contrary evidence on its "finding" that Amtrak had separate policies for the Spectacular and the rest of Penn Station. Pet. App. 15a-16a. When Lebron pointed out in a rehearing petition that Amtrak had conceded and the district court had found that the same substantive policy governed both the Spectacular and the rest of Penn Station advertising, the court deleted those references from its opinion, *id.* 3b; and instead sought to justify its refusal to consider the contrary evidence on the ground that "Lebron insisted that TDI display his proposed advertisement only on the Spectacular," *id.*

customers. The court of appeals' decision thus effectively redefined the legal contours of the public forum doctrine.

Nor did this Court's recent decision in *Arkansas Educational Television Comm'n v. Forbes*, 1998 WL 244196 (U.S. Sup. Ct. May 18, 1998), set forth any new principles of public forum analysis that should not already have been known to the court of appeals. In reviewing those settled principles, the Court restated that to create a designated public forum, "the government must intend to make the property 'generally available,' to a class of speakers." *Id.* at *8 (quoting *Widmar v. Vincent*, 454 U.S. 263, 264 (1981)). To determine the government's intentions, the Court repeated that it looks to "the policy and practice of the government" and "[i]f the government excludes a speaker who falls within the class to which a designated public forum is made generally available, its action is subject to strict scrutiny." *Id.* at *7 (quoting *Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Ed. Fund, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 788, 802 (1985)). In this case, Amtrak concedes that in making advertising space available throughout Penn Station, including the Spectacular, it employed a single advertising policy applicable to all comers who complied with it. Amtrak's *practice* in applying its policy shows that it did not exclude political advertising, including noncommercial advertising for *The Plain Truth* magazine. Thus, under the reasoning of this Court's past cases as repeated in *Arkansas Educational Television Comm'n*, the exclusion of Lebron's advertisement from the Spectacular because it was "political" should have been subject to strict scrutiny.

Essentially, the court of appeals' decision ignored the constitutional analysis, refusing *as a legal matter* to look beyond the particular bulletin board to which petitioner sought access, and deeming irrelevant all contrary evidence regarding the nature of the forum and the implementation of the asserted policy. Particularly where, as here, the policy is unwritten, such a conception of the public forum doctrine

reduces it to a mere rubber stamp of the government's decision.[3]

Amtrak objects that the court of appeals did look at past practice *with respect to the Spectacular*. Br. in Opp. 14. But that begs the question of what past practices must be examined. As Judge Newman noted in dissenting from the denial of rehearing, Pet. App. 5b-6b, once the panel acknowledged that the same policy governed all Penn Station advertising, Amtrak's implementation of the policy throughout the Station became relevant. Because the same substantive policy governed all Penn Station advertising, by definition any ad displayed in Penn Station—including the *Plain Truth* ads—could have been displayed on the Spectacular.

While no political ad had been previously displayed on the Spectacular, it is also true that no one had ever before asked to display a political ad there; in fact, only a handful of ads had ever appeared there (presumably because of the expense involved). More to the point, but deemed irrelevant by the court of appeals, under Amtrak's asserted policy against political advertising, Amtrak had *never* before refused to display an ad for its political content, and had regularly displayed political, noncommercial ads.

By focusing exclusively on the Spectacular and disregarding as legally irrelevant all objective evidence contravening Amtrak's assertions, the court of appeals' decision conflicts squarely with *Air Line Pilots Ass'n v. Department of Aviation*, 45 F.3d 1144, 1154 (7th Cir. 1995). In that case, although the union sought access to a single display case in O'Hare Airport's Concourse B, 44 F.3d at 1148, the Seventh

---

[3] Amtrak disingenuously suggests that petitioner previously took the position that Amtrak's policy was written, and only now argues that it is "unwritten" and "undisseminated." Br. in Opp. 6 n.4. But petitioner has always criticized the policy as "unwritten." A policy barring "political" ads was reflected in writing in some of Amtrak's old leasing contracts, but as the district court found, none of those contracts was in effect at the time this dispute arose. Pet. App. 15c-16c.

Circuit did not define the forum as one specific display case, nor as Concourse B advertising, but as all O'Hare Airport advertising. As here, the critical fact was that one policy governed all advertising in the transportation facility.

Indeed, the *Air Line Pilots Ass'n* court reversed the district court specifically because it had examined only the 48 display cases in Concourse B, United Airlines' concourse, rather than all O'Hare concourse advertising. *Id.* at 1154. Here, by contrast, the panel majority limited its inquiry to a single display case, the Spectacular, and wholly disregarded the district court's findings that Amtrak had opened other display cases in Penn Station to noncommercial, political advertising *under the same policy*.[4]

Respondents argue that the fact that Lebron sought access specifically to the Spectacular justifies defining the forum as the Spectacular. Br. in Opp. 16-17. But even assuming that the forum is properly defined as the Spectacular, the inquiry into the *nature* of the forum must examine Amtrak's implementation of its asserted policy against political advertising throughout Penn Station, where Amtrak has conceded and the district court has found that one policy governed all Penn Station advertising.

The court of appeals' blindered approach to the public forum doctrine would, as Judge Newman argued in dissent, permit Amtrak to allow the Democratic Party to place political ads on either side of the Penn Station rotunda and then

---

[4] Amtrak seeks to characterize the other political ads it displayed as materially different from petitioner's ad. Br. in Opp. 19 n.9. But Amtrak never challenged as clearly erroneous the district court's finding that Amtrak had displayed numerous noncommercial ads in Penn Station. Pet. App. 19c-20c. In light of that undisputed finding, the court of appeals was able to conclude that the forum had never been open "for anything except purely commercial advertising," *id.* 10a, only by treating the district court's finding as legally irrelevant. It is that legal issue, not any dispute about the facts, that petitioner presents here.

deny access to the Spectacular to the Republican Party on the ground that its policy prohibited political advertising. Pet. App. 21a. In other words, the panel's approach would rob the public forum doctrine of any meaningful protection for speech.

The Court should grant the writ to ensure the continued "vitality" of the public forum doctrine, by making clear that courts may not disregard as legally irrelevant objective evidence concerning the nature of the forum and the government's practice in implementing a challenged speech access policy.

II. THE COURT OF APPEALS' DETERMINATION THAT AMTRAK'S POLICY WAS VIEWPOINT-NEUTRAL CONFLICTS WITH DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND OTHER COURTS OF APPEALS

Lebron argued that Amtrak's conduct in this case was viewpoint-discriminatory in two respects: (1) it permitted the display of the conservative noncommercial *Plain Truth* ad while barring the display of Lebron's liberal ad on the ground that it was noncommercial; and (2) its policy of barring "political" while accepting "commercial" advertisements on the same subject is viewpoint-based under this Court's decisions holding policies against "religious" speech viewpoint-based. Pet. 18-21.

Amtrak's only response to the first argument is to proffer a new theory regarding advertising for publications that finds no support in the record and is contradicted by Amtrak's own officials' testimony.[5] The undisputed fact is that Amtrak dis-

[5] Amtrak now claims that its display of the *Plain Truth* ad was consistent with "the acceptance of advertisements for publications without reference to the publication's content," Br. in Opp. 19 n.9. This assertion is contradicted by Amtrak's own officials' testimony, and does not explain the acceptance of an ad for a purely noncommercial magazine. The Amtrak Vice-President in charge of advertising testified that an ad discussing *Time* magazine's coverage of Mikhail Gorbachev's fall would

played conservative noncommercial ads for *The Plain Truth* in the Penn Station concourse for five years, and then informed Lebron that it would not display his ad in the same concourse because it was noncommercial. A more blatant form of viewpoint discrimination would be difficult to imagine.

As to petitioner's second viewpoint discrimination argument, Amtrak maintains that its policy is viewpoint-neutral because it prohibits political "subject matter," not political viewpoints. But as the undisputed record illustrates, Amtrak consistently permitted the display of ads addressing political "subject matter."

The *Plain Truth* ad displayed at the time Amtrak rejected petitioner's ad addressed the issue of adultery, a subject matter no less "political" than whether consumers should purchase Coors beer because of the causes its owners support.[6] And under Amtrak's policy, an ad with the same subject matter as Lebron's—urging persons not to buy Coors beer—would be permissible if its perspective was commercial rather than political. Pet. App. 24a.

---

be barred as "political." DeAngelo Dep. at 308, 314; A835; E306. Amtrak cites only E261 and E347 as support for its newly claimed policy, neither of which even addresses the issue. E261 lists advertisers who displayed ads in Penn Station, and E347 is petitioner's objection to the quality of certain photocopies. And this new claim by Amtrak's lawyers fails to explain how an ad for a purely noncommercial magazine falls within a policy that assertedly permits the display only of commercial ads.

[6] Not only was the *Plain Truth* advertised from a four-sided, seven-foot high kiosk immediately in front of the Spectacular, but the kiosk had bins attached to it containing copies of the magazine for free distribution to the public. Pet. App. 7a, 20c; E202-03.

III. AMTRAK'S POLICY IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE UNDER *HYNES V. MAYOR OF ORADELL*

Amtrak contends that the panel majority's one-sentence determination that Amtrak's policy is not vague is consistent with *Hynes v. Mayor of Oradell*, 425 U.S. 610 (1976), because in *Hynes* this Court objected to the failure to define "cause," not "political." This reading is disingenuous.

The ordinance *Hynes* invalidated required permits for solicitations "for a Federal, State, County or Municipal political campaign or cause." 425 U.S. at 614 n.1. In declaring the ordinance vague, the Court expressly stated, "nor is political 'cause' defined." *Id.* at 622. Describing the vagueness challenge, the Court stated that "persons canvassing for political causes would be uncertain whether the ordinance covered them." *Id.* at 621 n.5. The constitutional infirmity was that "cause" was modified only by "political," and therefore would-be canvassers were at a loss as to which causes were prohibited. "Political advertising" is no more clear than "political cause," and leaves would-be advertisers to guess as to what is permitted and what is not.

Finally, Amtrak argues that the plurality decision in *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298 (1974), supports the court of appeals' vagueness determination. Plaintiff in *Lehman* did not present a vagueness challenge, and the plurality does not address the issue. Amtrak nonetheless argues that *Lehman* implicitly supports the result below because the plurality failed to respond to the dissent's contention that the distinction between ideological and nonideological speech was "impossible to draw with accuracy." Br. in Opp. 24. But the plurality expressly relied on the Ohio Supreme Court's narrow construction of the ordinance to distinguish sharply between advertisers seeking to sell a good or service, and all others. 418 U.S. at 303-04. The Ohio Supreme Court's construction may well be a constitutionally discernible line, but it is not the line Amtrak drew. As the district court found, Pet.

App. 16c-19c, Amtrak's unwritten policy meant something different to every official charged with implementing it, and had no sharp lines. That is precisely the problem.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID D. COLE
Counsel of Record
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 662-9078

GLORIA C. PHARES
JEFFREY H. BLUM
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB & TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 336-2000

R. BRUCE RICH
BERNADETTE M. MCCANN EZRING
JONATHAN BLOOM
MARC BROTMAN
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153
(212) 310-8000

May 1998